

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

MARCH 18, 1939

WHO'S WHO

ROBERT E. CURDA has already been introduced as a reporter from Texas and a production analyst in Chicago. Some concrete experiences have led him to the conclusion that Catholic Action's first field is the field of one's personal life. . . . GERARD DONNELLY wished to get the record straight before time and admiration shall have colored it with legends. But few legends are more marvelous than the epic of the future Pope who viewed in a few hours more of the United States than most American citizens see in a lifetime. . . . LAWRENCE LUCEY is alliteratively labeled as a learned lawyer from Long Island. He adds another contribution to our pages in order to bless, temperately, the much-maligned income tax while suggesting, thoughtfully, a couple of improvements. . . . JOHN LAFARGE believes that the present moment is particularly opportune for disentangling the threads of thought readily confused when political aims are attributed to Church and to Pope. The press has laid particular stress upon the political significance of the choice of His Holiness for the high office he holds at present. . . . THOMAS GRADY is an American studying for the priesthood in Rome, who undeniably kept his eyes and his imagination wide open when he had his audience with the late Pontiff, presented on a catafalque rather than on the usual *Sedia gestatoria*. This week's poets have all appeared before, and can be easily checked as to identity in previous files, though we suspect that for most of our readers this will hardly be necessary as they are already well known.

THIS WEEK

COMMENT	554
GENERAL ARTICLES	
Pius XII as Christ's Vicar Is Not a Political Pope John LaFarge	556
Income Tax Laws Assess the People's Ability to Pay	Lawrence Lucey 558
Catholic Action Starts with the Individual Person Robert E. Curda	560
The New Pope Saw America First Gerard Donnelly	561
EDITORIALS	564
Reorganization . . . Orgy or Fair? . . . One Union . . . The War Mongers Demand . . . Christ's Vicar . . . Immortals . . . That All May Eat.	
CHRONICLE	567
CORRESPONDENCE	569
LITERATURE AND ARTS	
An Audience with a Dead Pope... Thomas Grady	570
The Field Is Wide Open..... L. F.	571
POETRY	572
Not Being Aquin..... Alfred Barrett	
Climb Up to God..... Jessica Corrigan Pegis	
Ex Voto GMH..... David Gordon	
Whither Thou Goest..... Jessica Powers	
This One Heart-Shaken..... Sister Maris Stella	
BOOKS	REVIEWED BY 573
Recusant Poets..... Leonard Feeney	
Betrayal in Central Europe..... John J. O'Connor	
The Tree of Liberty..... Joseph R. N. Maxwell	
ART	Harry Lorin Binsse 575
THEATRE	Elizabeth Jordan 575
FILMS	Thomas J. Fitzmorris 576
EVENTS	The Parader 576

Editor-in-Chief: FRANCIS X. TALBOT.

Associate Editors: PAUL L. BLAKELY, JOHN LAFARGE, GERARD DONNELLY,
JOHN A. TOOMEY, LEONARD FEENEY, WILLIAM J. BENN, ALBERT I. WHELAN.

Editorial Office: 329 W. 108TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Business Manager: STEPHEN J. MEANY.

Business Office: 53 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK CITY.

AMERICA. Published weekly by The America Press, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y., March 18, 1939, Vol. LX, No. 24, Whole No. 1536. Telephone BARclay 7-8993. Cable Address: Cathreview. United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly \$4.00; Canada, \$4.50; Foreign, \$5.00. Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, under Act of March 3, 1879. AMERICA, A Catholic Review of the Week, Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

COMMENT

NOW more than ever is recognition of the Spanish Nationalist Government opportune. If there were any reason for hesitation before, because it might be asserted that some semblance of authority, however illegitimate, remained in Madrid, all such pretense falls to the ground. No government that can be even remotely designated as such exists. Azaña, the former President, is gone; Negrin, the Premier, has followed; the Cortes is so disrupted and scattered that a quorum cannot be convoked. In a word, the so-called Republican Government has ceased to function. What remains in Madrid and Valencia and the rest of the Loyalist territory is disorder and chaos. Hunger and want stalk the streets; disunion and internal dissension prevail everywhere. Only the great humanity of Generalissimo Franco restrains him from commencing military operations that would result in frightful carnage. He has waited long and patiently for the inevitable surrender, but patience is growing thin. Even he cannot withstand the demands of the nation behind him to terminate with a final stroke the exhausting struggle. President Roosevelt has asserted at a press conference that our Government still maintains diplomatic relations with Madrid. With what government, we ask, since none exists. Our delay in recognizing the only existing Government in Spain is contributing to the prolongation of suffering of her unfortunate people. Spain calls to us to aid her in procuring peace, while the Administration still parleys with this mask of democracy. No excuse can be alleged now for delaying our recognition of *the* Spanish Government.

WHY keep hammering on Spain? Why should this topic be resurrected with each issue of AMERICA? Now that the Spanish civil war has been won, why should we not turn our attention to home affairs, no longer discuss these burning issues, and be content with humanitarian relief? Were not the answer painfully obvious, we might ask ourselves this same question. For those who still need it, however, the answer was provided a few days ago by Vincent Sheean, pro-Red journalist, who appears to be devoting some very genuine talents, much better employed elsewhere, to vilifying the Catholic Church through the medium of the Spanish issue. Mr. Sheean took as his occasion, peculiarly unfitted for such a performance, a luncheon attended by the Association of Teachers of English in the New York City schools. The Catholic Church, he was reported as saying, was the only reason why our country had "sold out" to Nationalist Spain. The situation had "better be looked into—better get a doctor." Though the floor was opened to questions, one of New York's best known and most distinguished women educators, who wished a clarification of

Mr. Sheean's remarks, could not gain recognition by the chairman. The campaign continues, and will continue until it expires from sheer inanity. But while it lasts, misunderstanding and hatred are built up against the Catholic Church. While it lasts, the truth must be unwearyingly proclaimed.

THAT the Jews have no interest in productive farming is a myth. Not only is it a myth, but few groups in this country at the present time are working in so practical a way to open the doors of farming as a means of livelihood for city dwellers as are the Jews described in the annual report of the Jewish Agricultural Society, Inc., made public on March 7. Dr. Gabriel Davison, general manager of the society, which guides and aids Jews who desire to go into farming, reported that last year 1,222 persons sought the society's services, and eighty-four families comprising about 400 individuals were settled on farms in seven States. The Jewish farmer engages in all types of farming, but is particularly active in poultry farming, where he is rapidly becoming regarded as an expert. Dr. Davison looks upon Jewish agriculture as an opportunity to "prove that Jews possess primary productive capacity, that they can work with brawn as well as with brain." If more European Jews had gone into farming, he adds, their catastrophe would have been less severe. He finds that there are always Jews who wish to go into farm life. But the growth of the Jewish farm movement may have another and equally salutary effect. It may awaken non-Jewish city dwellers to opportunities which they have been too prone to despise, particularly to opportunities for linking rural and urban life. For another current belief, not so mythical, holds that when the Jewish people go after a definite economic or cultural goal, there is usually therein some concrete advantage.

MOURNFUL news has come from England, telling that Father Joseph Keating, S.J., editor of the *Month* since 1912, passed to his eternal reward on March 5 last. Irish in blood, Scotch in birth, English in education, his sympathies were agreeably distributed for purposes of fulfilling the important office to which obedience had assigned him in the Society of Jesus. The names of Keating and the *Month* have practically become synonymous in the minds of the whole Catholic-speaking world. It was a happy liaison, because Father Keating had interests and abilities large enough for his function. He was very nearly the perfect editor. Though given at times to specialized writing, such as being Joint Editor of the "Westminster Version" of the Scriptures, the writer of books on such subjects as

Peace, Temperance, The Catholic Conscience, as well as of innumerable pamphlets on various moot questions, he had no "specialties" in the narrowing sense. His specialty, as behooves a good editor, was to preside with judiciousness and generosity over all type of articles sent in by his contributors which affected the general interests of the Church. There were, however, reams of writing to be done in his own Editorial Comment in the *Month*, a symposium of which would reveal a wealth of wisdom and an almost infallible Catholic instinct for the right position. Catholics in America will remember Father Keating's visit to this country a few years ago. We have never had a more understanding or a less truculent visitor. Father Keating was in person a man of most soothing manners and agreeable repose. A visit with him in his sanctum at Mount Street in London found him always in a receptive mood, never "in a hurry" to get rid of a possible intruder. The way in which his conversation could range with equal agility over such subjects as theology, economics, international problems, history, literature, the fine arts, even down to a minute criticism of a quatrain of poetry, was quite a marvel to behold. It will be hard indeed for the *Month* to replace Father Keating. Except that his successor will have encouragement of a long and sound tradition always at hand to consult in the files of that periodical. May his soul rest in peace, and his laurels never fade!

CUTTING down trees on a New Jersey estate as a means of expressing protest against Mayor Frank Hague, of Jersey City, is an odd way of an attempt at retaliation. It is like cutting off one's nose to spite one's face. For some time a sign at the entrance to the estate read: "Because Hague Is the Law—For Sale." That is all well enough. If one does not like the way a State is run, and can afford it, the best thing to do is to move out. And it would seem that the party in question is in such a financial position. But that Frank Hague, Jr., should have been nominated by New Jersey's Governor as a judge of the Court of Errors and Appeals was the last straw. Workmen were forthwith assigned to begin execution on the 1,200 trees that adorn the estate. It would seem that the means of protest are not commensurate with the intended end. No one, least of all in the Jersey City administration, is going to be affected very materially by the process of deforestation. The property was already up for sale and the trees would appear rather to be an asset. So the denuding process hits back at the owner. But maybe the proprietor intends to finance from the returns of the sale of his trees a campaign to oust the Mayor of Jersey City.

"LIBERTY of speech is denied us, the freedom of the person grossly violated, and the sacredness of our homes invaded. Such treatment is not new to us, but within the last few months it has been aggravated. Men are arrested, thrown into prison and detained there without any charge brought against

them; their guilt is assumed until they are proved to be innocent." This is not a record of atrocities in a totalitarian state. It is taken from the Lenten Pastoral of the Bishop of Down and Connor narrating the grievances suffered by the Catholic minority in the Six Counties. In sharp contrast with the "vindictive activity of religious intolerance" in the North is the notable example of justice and impartiality in the South referred to in another pastoral by Dr. Browne, Bishop of Galway. "Our people have recently given a noble example of their sense of justice and impartiality. Although in Britain the law bars Catholics from the headship of the State; although in the United States the greatest statesman of the country was only a few years ago excluded from the Presidency simply because he was a Catholic; although in the Six Counties Catholics are excluded from high office; notwithstanding all these examples of intolerance all round them, the Catholic people of this country unanimously and without division of party chose a member of the religious minority for the highest office in the State." These and such examples are never mentioned when the liberty and toleration of the democratic states are extolled above the totalitarian.

DESPITE the report circulated from Puerto Rico that the Nationalist Government in Spain is seeking the return of the Island as part of her program of restoration of Spain's lost colonies, there is adequate reason for doubting the rumor. Doubtless the report originated from some enthusiastic Puerto Rican admirers of the Franco regime. Nowhere in the numerous pronouncements made by the Generalissimo about the future Spain has any reference been made to her lost territory. It is ridiculous on the face of it, since this would include the return of the greater part of Central and South America. It would be well to await Franco's announcement before letting idle rumors further prejudice us against Spain.

APPEARANCES would seem to point to the fact that the day is coming when the Government will owe the greater majority of people in the United States a living. Government in this country, according to the Bureau of Census, is the largest employer of the nation. One worker in every nine finds a place on a public payroll, and if to this figure were added the number of people on relief or working on relief projects, the percentage would probably reach one in every ten. About one-third are employed directly by the Federal Government, an equal proportion in State, local and miscellaneous Federal jobs, and the remaining third by our public educational system. There is one notable fact that appears in the recently published statistics. A marked increase is evidenced in the Federal percentage of employment for the past eight years. No particular objection can be made to this rise in the number of Federal employes, provided they are not mere political appointees. The obvious inference stresses the necessity of a just civil service.

PIUS XII AS CHRIST'S VICAR IS NOT A POLITICAL POPE

Fidelity of Church to spiritual mission is unchanging

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

AS is to be expected in the election of a Pontiff who was formerly Papal Secretary of State, press correspondents are busy with speculations as to which political side he is likely to take. Utterances of one group of correspondents to the effect that the new Pope's election is displeasing to the totalist Powers annoy other groups who are alarmed at seeing the Pope put forward as an advocate of democratic governments.

In a simple sense, of course, the new Pope is "political." He has for years occupied with brilliancy a major political position, as Papal Secretary of State. He knows as much as any person living the political issues and currents of the day; and he has dealt with the world's leading politicians.

But this obvious fact gives no ground for attractive speculations on the position for or against certain governments, that the Pontiff may take.

Such speculations rest upon assumptions which are consciously or unconsciously assimilated by the average non-Catholic mind. These assumptions are rooted in traditional beliefs concerning the Papacy and its office in the world. They center, in one way or another, around an idea that the Church is seeking some kind of temporal domination. The old Lutheran notion was that the Pope of Rome, and with him the Catholic Church, always looked for wealth and power. This view colors the observations on early and medieval Christianity of so scholarly a man as Ernest Troeltsch; and through his pages it has filtered down to a multitude of lesser lights. It is reflected in the nineteenth-century apocalyptic visions of Russian Orthodox theologians and novelists who saw Rome's "pride" opposed to the "humility" of the East; the "pride" of the Papal Mass as contrasted with the "humility" of the Byzantine Liturgy.

For the totalist governments, whether Communist, National Socialist or Fascist, it is practically impossible to see anything else in the Papacy than a rival to their own state-centered autocracy. Anything that interferes with a complete domination over religion wherever and whenever it comes in contact with society is denounced as "political Catholicism." The Nazis at the present moment are circulating an illustrated pamphlet for foreign consumption which tries to demonstrate that religion

is perfectly free in Germany as long as it remains entirely "unpolitical." As a reaction to such an attitude, it is natural enough that the non-Nazi world should seek to combat Nazism by pushing forward the Church as a peculiarly exalted and powerful political agent. The extreme instance of such a position is the crude Communist attempt to force the Church to political anti-Fascist warfare.

The Church of Christ is not political. The Church is not economically profitable; nor is the Church social, nor educational or cultural. Political welfare and stability, civilized society, schools and cultural life are all fostered by the Church. At certain periods of history they owe, in great measure, their origin to her. Where her teachings are followed, there is usually some degree of economic prosperity. But she is none of these things, nor are their aims her aims.

The Church is a community of souls, bound together in a supernatural yet organic unity. Her aim is to fulfil in all times and all places, even to the end of time, the mission for which her Founder, Jesus Christ, came into this world. This aim is the establishment of the eternal Kingdom of God in the souls of those who compose her membership, that Kingdom which is not of this world; to communicate to each of these souls, as completely and as exclusively as if it were the only soul for which Christ had died, that eternal life which begins here upon earth when man is born again through Baptism and Divine Grace, which is consummated in the vision of God for eternity.

The Church, as the theologians say, is a "perfect society," having her own exclusive ends, and possessing in fulness the means for accomplishing those ends. Her teaching, her sacramental and liturgical life, her discipline and her hierarchal constitution, all are derived from her Founder, all are perfectly adapted to enable her to fulfil that work for which He came into the world and which He has entrusted to her until the end of time.

So the Church is not *dependent* upon society or social organization, but can save souls in the midst of anarchy. She does not *depend* upon schools or education; she can give her message to the ignorant, to the unemployed. She can send souls to Heaven from the battlefield.

Moreover, the Church has her own social or family organization, for her members themselves form one great Christian family, in which all peoples and races are brothers. She has her own "political" life, for she is organized with rulers (the Pope and Bishops), with laws, with legal institutions and courts for the administration of her own supernatural work. She has her own school, the pulpit, where she teaches the message that the Saviour entrusted to her to keep; the liturgy, which speaks by poetry, prayer, symbol and ceremony. She has even her own economics in the use of material things: the economics of apostolic Poverty doing business with Divine Providence.

Nevertheless—and here is the great paradox—though the Church is independent of human institutions, she always cherishes them, as something entirely congenial to her aims, provided they are truly human, and not fraudulent imitations concocted by man's avarice and pride. The Church is solicitous for everything that aids the integrity of family life, such as the home, private property, stable means of subsistence (on the land) or of employment granting family wages; because normally men save their souls through the "mutual help" of the family, and families live, grow and attain to perfection best under certain conditions.

She is deeply interested in cultural matters, in education, in schools and universities and learned organizations, for the same reason. The Church is concerned about the constitution of the state, not that this or that form of government be followed, but that whatever be the type of government it be one consistent with the traditions and temper of the people, that it be just and charitable, respecting the rights and dignity of the human person; that it rule by genuine authority, not by tyranny, and that it respect her own Divinely given rights. The Church seeks to further all these things not by directly establishing or administering them, but by creating such an unswerving devotion to human rights and to the common good among her members as will make them instinctively promote a just organization of society and of the state.

If we look back to the late Pope Pius XI, we find this exemplified in his own life and utterances. As Visible Head of the Church, he expounded the philosophy of the family as the basic unit of society, in his Encyclical *Casti Connubii*, on Christian Marriage. The economic problems of the home and family were dealt with in his two great social Encyclicals, *Quadragesimo Anno* and *Divini Redemptoris*, which dealt, too, with those natural economic institutions that lie midway between the family and the state. The Encyclical on Christian Education dealt with the school. The problem of the state is treated in many aspects in a corresponding number of utterances through his long pontificate.

During a good part of those years when Pius XI spoke and acted as Pope, his future successor was in charge of the innumerable practical questions which arise at all times from the contact of the Church, as a world-wide visible institution, with the various states and governments in the world. They concern every phase of the Church's life, and

they touch on every phase of the life of the states and governments where she exercises her mission, from schools in Germany to veneration of the Emperor in Japan; from forced labor in African mission countries to diocesan boundaries in Hungary. Yet varied as are all the questions which daily confront a Cardinal Secretary of State, the solution in every case is reached through the same identical principle, the unchanging fidelity of the Church to her non-political, purely spiritual mission. Not the shifting pathway of earthly politics, but the changeless pole-star of the Kingdom charts the course for Peter's Bark as it sails the stormy seas of time.

In the ordinary course of events, Pius XII, as Pope, will entrust his former office of Secretary of State to one of his former colleagues. He, in his turn, will apply his best knowledge to these innumerable practical questions, yet following the principles of the Holy See, as did Cardinal Pacelli before him. As Pope, Pius XII is now free from these particular cares, free to turn his mind to carrying to a successful conclusion that tremendous task which his predecessor undertook, of setting in order the principles of those *natural institutions*—social, economic, cultural, political—which the Church cherishes as a true mother to men.

The first message of the new "Pius," calling all men to work and pray for peace, was an indication of what we may expect from the coming Pontificate. He spoke with particular affection to all outside the Church, and these multitudes outside the Church were enthusiastic over his election.

Some of this enthusiasm may be explained by the fact that he is a known, not an unknown personage, to millions of non-Catholics through his visit to the United States and other countries. Some of it is evidently due to an inadequate understanding of the Pope's position with regard to purely temporal matters. Appalled by the abuses of human rights which political agencies are now exercising; failing to understand that the Pope's approach to such problems must necessarily remain in the religious and ethical field, not in the political field as such, he is acclaimed as one who will speedily strive to achieve salutary political ends.

But allowing all discount for the first, a genuine reason, and for the second, an inadequate one, there still remains a mighty residue of realization, on the part of non-Catholics, of the simple fact that Pope Pius XII is first and foremost a man of God, that he is a spiritual man, that he will treat the political issues of the day in a spiritual manner, and, finally, that such a treatment is the only one which will bring peace and order into the world today. "A man of holiness and virility" is the noble characterization given to Pope Pius XII by that experienced publicist, Edwin L. James, writing in the *New York Times*. The major acclaim is for Pius XII, the man of the spirit, the man of God, despite his exalted office the simple and humble follower of the Crucified Christ. Those who look upon him in that light, and understand this basic truth, are the only ones who will have the key to the dealings, past, present or future, of Pope Pius XII with the political institutions of the world.

INCOME TAX LAWS ASSESS THE PEOPLE'S ABILITY TO PAY

Amendment is needed to make application equitable

LAWRENCE LUCEY

THE deadline set by the Government for the filing of income-tax returns with the Collector of Internal Revenue in your district was Wednesday, March 15. Citizens of the United States whether living here or not, aliens residing in America, and aliens with an American income no matter where they live, must file a return with the Government if they are single and fortunate enough to have earned a net income of \$1,000 or more in 1938, or married and having a net income of \$2,500 or better.

The tax which these people must pay is graduated. "People" includes the babies lawyers create by drafting papers, corporations. The larger the income the higher the tax. Small incomes are taxed at the rate of four per cent. With higher incomes the rate increases until a maximum of seventy-five per cent is reached on incomes over \$5,000,000. For the fiscal year 1938 over forty per cent of the Federal revenue was derived from the income tax when \$2,635,000,000 flowed into the Treasury.

The income tax and the tax on the estates of the dead are the only levies which present a larger bill to the rich man than they do to the poor, the only taxes which recognize the fact that it costs a married man more to live than it does a single man. Because these two taxes make use of the ability-to-pay principle they are the most equitable and scientific means yet devised to pay the cost of Government. Because these two taxes exempt the man with a small income or estate, they are not only socially sound taxes but they help our economy by refraining from taking money from the poor and thereby permit them to buy goods they could not purchase if the Government collected this tax from them.

As far back as 1785 Thomas Jefferson, while residing in France and seeing poverty in person during his walks, wrote in a letter to Madison:

I asked myself what could be the reason that so many should be permitted to beg who are willing to work, in a country where there is a very considerable proportion of uncultivated lands. . . . I am conscious that an equal division of property is impracticable. . . . But legislators cannot invent too many devices for subdividing property. . . . Another means of silently lessening the inequality of property is to exempt all from taxation below a certain point and to tax the higher portions of property in geometrical progression. Whenever there is in any country un-

cultivated lands and unemployed poor, it is clear that the laws of property have been so far extended as to violate natural rights.

This tax suggested by Jefferson was employed first by Lincoln during the Civil War. The income tax was another of Jefferson's unrealized ideals that Lincoln put into practice. Lincoln, you know, practiced Jefferson's preachments on slavery and Government-issued money, "greenbacks."

After the Civil War the income tax was repealed and it was not until 1894 that it was revived. This measure was later declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in a five to four decision. Joseph H. Choate, the famous lawyer, called the income tax "a communist march on private property" while arguing against it before the Supreme Court. But far-sighted and social-minded Justice John M. Harlan, in his dissenting opinion, declared: "No tax is more just in its essence than an income tax. . . . On my conscience I regard this decision as a disaster." In February, 1913, this decision was overruled by the people when they adopted the Sixteenth Amendment, authorizing Congress to levy an income tax.

Sales taxes and real property taxes are much easier to levy and collect than is an income tax. Likewise, the taxpayer does not have to answer pages of questions and solve complicated arithmetic problems to pay a sales or real property tax, as he does when he fills out his income tax return. Simplification of our income tax law is a pressing problem that ought to be dealt with at the earliest possible moment.

Last year Mrs. Elinor F. Morgenthau, wife of the Secretary of the Treasury, paid \$1,449 more than she should have, due to an error in her tax return. When a lady with such competent advisers as had Mrs. Morgenthau can make an error in her return there is something rotten in the law; it is too complicated and indefinite and should be simplified so that it will require little mental effort to make an exact and honest return. This suggestion will be unpopular with tax lawyers and accountants, but it is beneficial both to those who must pay the tax and the Government. The chaos and red tape surrounding the law make it an open target for ridicule and give reactionary forces a strong argument for preventing the Government

from relying more heavily and almost exclusively, in my opinion, on the income tax as its source of revenue.

Economically, the income tax is the best of all taxes. Income taxes cannot be added to the price of goods sold by a business and as a consequence they do not raise prices as do sales and commodity taxes. An increase in the price of goods that results from a tax, and not from the law of supply and demand, tends to slow up business activity by cutting sales, and causes unemployment. Much more gasoline and tobacco would be sold in this country if they were purchasable at the low price the retailer gets for them minus the commodity taxes. The income tax on the gasoline and tobacco concerns does not cut down their sales by raising prices as do the ordinary commodity taxes, which are in current use.

Again, the income tax is most fair. The owner of a building that is unoccupied and produces no revenue must pay the same real estate tax as he would pay if the building were fully occupied and yielding high rents. But when there is no income or a small return no income tax need be paid. If a man had a large income in 1937 and it fell away to almost nothing in 1938, he must pay a high tax for 1937 and none for 1938.

By exempting the first \$2,500 of a married man's income and only \$1,000 of the single man's, this tax tries to make it easier financially for a couple to wed. Today, one of the main obstacles preventing the young from marrying is the absence of money. Sales taxes and hidden taxes, since they increase with the amount of goods purchased, tax the married couple twice as much as they do the single man, for ordinarily the single man buys only half as much does the married man.

By allowing a \$400 exemption for each child under eighteen years a parent has dependent on him, the law encourages people to bring children into the world; to a minor extent it counteracts the birth-control propaganda that says it costs too much to have children. However, in the low income brackets where the tax rate is four per cent, the taxpayer only saves sixteen dollars for each child dependent on him. It would seem that a most effective way to fight the birth-control movement is to have this exemption raised considerably so that the taxpayer may be able to deduct the reasonable cost of supporting a child for a year from his income tax.

In recent years considerable resentment has arisen against those with exorbitant incomes, incomes that amount to one or two hundred thousand dollars or more. These high incomes could be stopped by a simple amendment to the income tax law; an amendment taxing personal incomes above a certain level 100 per cent. Personally, I believe no man is worth more than \$50,000 per year, and I would like to see any personal income above this figure taxed 100 per cent. Naturally, the Government would not increase its revenue much by such a law for no business would pay a man more than \$50,000 when they know he would have to hand all above this figure to the Government. But by sav-

ing this money the business could use it to increase the wages of its low-paid labor.

Prior to the writing of this paper, the House of Representatives passed a bill authorizing the Federal Government to tax the salaries of State and local Government employes, and granted permission to the States with income tax laws to tax the salaries of Federal employes. Most likely this bill will be passed by the Senate. As the President has advocated such a law in two messages, he undoubtedly will sign it. This amendment to the income tax law is a step forward as it places the Government employe in the same position as everyone else. In the words of Congressman Boehne:

Because a person has been appointed or elected to a public office is no reason why he should be placed in a preferred class. It may not be too much to hope that when all public employes will be obliged to pay their just share of the cost of government, that they then will also see the justice in the argument of the great majority of American people that the cost of government is entirely too high and that a curtailment is necessary now.

As to the other and more important part of the President's messages, the removal of the exemption on the interest from *future* issued Federal, State and local bonds, I want to ask: Why not tax the more than \$65,000,000,000 of Government bonds already issued? Why not tax the interest of about \$2,000,000,000 per year that these bonds are yielding now? Why limit the income tax to Government bonds "hereafter issued"? Why not tax the income from all Government bonds, whether they are to be issued in the future or have been issued in the past?

The President did not limit his message to *future* employed Government workers; he wanted present and future employes of the Government to pay the income tax for the year 1939 forward. Why, then, not tax the interest derived from all Government bonds for the year 1939 forward? To my mind the exemption granted Government employes is on all fours with Government bonds, and to tax all Government employes and only future issued bonds, continuing the exemption on the \$65,000,000,000 of presently issued bonds, is an injustice that cries out to Congress for remedial action.

The income tax is the fairest, most scientific, most social and economically sound method a government can use to collect its revenue. Since the adoption of the Sixteenth Amendment thirty-one of the forty-eight States have followed the Federal example and are deriving part of their revenue from an income tax. The remaining seventeen States should adopt an income tax and substitute it for the hidden taxes they now use to obtain their revenue. Uniformity of State income tax laws is a necessity. The rate in Missouri should not be one per cent, graduated from two to seven per cent in New York, and six per cent in Massachusetts for a similar income.

America will, I hope, see the dawn of that future day when almost the entire revenue of its Federal, State and local governments will be obtained by presenting a bill to the taxpayer each year proportioned to the size of his income.

CATHOLIC ACTION STARTS WITH THE INDIVIDUAL PERSON

Emphasis must be placed on personal example

ROBERT E. CURDA

TWO years have elapsed since I left an environment dominated by the tone and spirit of Catholic Action and plunged into another where one listens long for even a note of Catholicism. Two years in which I came to see that there is another activity that should be added to the list of those included under the heading of Catholic Action, for during those two years an uncomfortable observation has been forced upon me; an observation, however, that brought me to read with thankfulness Father LaFarge's report and comment on the Jocist movement in the February 4 issue of AMERICA.

Working as I have, I soon learned that lack of the note of Catholicism was not always indicative of the absence of Catholics. I found instead that a too large section of our co-religionists is studiously avoiding anything and everything that, by its appearance in its business or social conduct, would indicate its Catholicism, much less any fervor.

Members of this section seem to be striving for perfect outward resemblance to their pagan—or at least unmoral—associates. I do not mean to infer by this that they are descending to open or habitual immorality, nor that they have fallen away from the Faith. Not at all. I mean, that they are successfully obliterating all marks distinguishing them either in spirit or act from the *habitués* of their business and social circles. Can it be that the salt is willingly giving up its savor for the bland insipidity of materialistic paganism?

No doubt they have chosen this course, in most cases, out of human respect, or to cover lack of information and training, or to avoid situations with which they felt they had not the ability nor strength to cope. Yet, there are some of them who present the aspect of clinging onto the bottom rung of the ladder to Heaven with one hand and dipping eagerly with the other into the materialistic puddle around their knees.

But it is not with these latter that I am concerned. I fear the first mentioned, and much larger group. I said I fear them. For not only do they serve to confirm pagans and materialists in *their* way, not only to woo thoughtless, uninformed, or weak Catholics into the same mold, but also to inflame the poor and downtrodden, who see in them a Church subservient to wealth and power.

Lest I be misunderstood, however, let me say that I quarrel with no one over the necessity, the duty, of providing for one's self and one's dependents to the best of one's ability; nor over the need of diplomacy on the part of the Catholic in many situations; nor even over the bad taste, if not inadvisability, of the injection of religion into the ordinary run of affairs. But I do take issue with those who have taken the above considerations, added them to the dictum that man's main duty here is to save his *own* soul, and used the mixture to grease their slide into Catholic inactivity.

Father LaFarge held up the key to the situation when he outlined the training to be given those who are to undertake the apostolate of the milieu. The individualization of which I spoke is suggested in the emphasis laid on personal example, the Closed Retreat, and the work of the priests in giving the "students" doctrinal instruction and guidance "to enable them to discover for themselves how to live the whole of Christian teaching in the circumstances that they are obliged to meet." However, as Father LaFarge outlined it, this training is to be for leaders that they might then go forth for the purpose of directing discussion groups.

The individualization I mentioned aims to reach a larger group, one section of which we have already considered, and with a more simplified "course of training" that will be considered later.

A second section of this group is indicated if one but takes the trouble to ask ten average Catholics what mental pictures they get on hearing the phrase "Catholic Action"; and next, to give a definition of the term.

You will be fortunate if one out of the ten gives you a reasonably precise definition; and you will find that the pictures range from complete blanks to hazy notions of meetings, reports and activities of gifted, moneyed, or super-dynamic persons.

You will note likewise that the personal-holiness aspect suffers considerably through neglect or through distortion—distortion because of the inaccurate but popular half-notions of personal holiness and of its implications.

The third section of this group consists of those thousands of young Catholics, heretofore the rank and file of scholastic Catholic Action organizations,

but now out of high school or college and entering business or the professions. Pleading lack of time, money, or even sufficient education and information, the majority of these either fail to enter or resist all efforts to draw them into parish, fraternal, or municipal Catholic Action groups.

The individualization, for which I hope, would seek to swing some of the boundless energy of the Catholic Action movement into the "leavening" of the hard-working present-generation Catholic; into instruction and guidance of our brethren that will do more than enable them to discern for themselves how to live the whole of Christian teaching in the circumstances they are obliged to meet. It would indicate for them, as far as possible, how their Catholic principles are to be applied.

Next, this individualization would call for the reiteration, with emphasis, on the positive, action effect of our example on others. The average Catholic, through frequent Confession, is accustomed to view his daily actions mainly from the standpoint of intent. He needs to be made aware of these actions as instruments with which he either builds up or tears down the Kingdom of God.

He should be brought to realize, also, that his every word or act can count directly, or indirectly,

for the cause of Catholic Action; that he need not be a member of a club or a group to be an active Catholic; that he needs only to pursue his daily tasks, aware that his behavior in these can give courage to a faltering brother, give pause to a pagan or atheist, and even serve as a guide for a lost sheep. He should be shown that it is on the basis of these everyday acts and words that personal holiness is built.

This type of instruction pertains particularly to the needs of the three sections I have discussed. Whenever possible the instruction should be preceded and complemented by the Closed Retreat. Such a retreat would give them (particularly the members of the first section) a chance to readjust their values, to re-align their lives and work with eternal principles, and should make them ready for the active Catholic lives they can and should lead.

In brief, as we enter into the apostolate of the milieu, we should, in my estimation, make provision for the "salting" of our own brethren. We suffer more injury from our own "dead timber" and lose more power by failing to work toward a full realization of the potentialities of the example of the rank and file than we ever will from any or all the attacks of our sworn enemies.

THE NEW POPE SAW AMERICA FIRST

A month's record Tom Heflin might read with horror

GERARD DONNELLY, S.J.

CARDINAL PACELLI came to this country as the guest of Mrs. Nicholas Brady, arriving in New York on October 8, 1936.

He was mildly amused, but not at all overwhelmed, by the half-hundred press and film men who boarded the *Conte*, flashed bulbs in his face, thrust microphones under his chin, questioned him sharply on Father Coughlin, the rumored re-establishment of Vatican-American relations and the real, honest-to-God reason for his coming to the country. The Cardinal disclaimed all secret and ulterior motives. He explained simply that he liked America and Americans and he wanted to see the country instead of merely reading about it.

After a courtesy call to the Chancery, he drove to Inisfada, Mrs. Brady's estate on Long Island,

which was to be his home in this country. The visitor made his first public appearance on Sunday, presiding at the Solemn Mass that marked the twenty-sixth anniversary of the consecration of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

Two days later the Cardinal was in New Haven, inspecting the Knights of Columbus headquarters. He went on to Hartford to talk to its Bishop and inspect St. Joseph's College, and arrived at Boston in the late evening of October 13 as the guest of his personal friend, Bishop Spellman. Two crowded days followed. A junior clergy conference; two speeches to priests and seminarians; a long conference with Cardinal O'Connell; an enthusiastic reception at Boston College.

The tower bell in Independence Hall rang an

official welcome when, on October 20, he came to Philadelphia to visit this shrine of American history. Conferences with Cardinal Dougherty and other prelates, together with a tour of the city, occupied the day. Early Wednesday morning he was in Baltimore with Archbishop Curley. With his host and other churchmen he motored to Washington for a formal dinner with the Apostolic Delegate. Next morning he began an astonishing day.

A gathering of 4,000 at Catholic University welcomed the Cardinal to a convocation. He accepted a doctorate of laws. His address—on Religion and Science—grew fervent as he called liberty and civic equality the "great glories of this nation"; it grew familiar as he revealed that many years ago he had been invited to join the University's teaching staff. Still later in the morning he made a thorough tour of the Library of Congress under the guidance of its chief official. An inspection of the N. C. W. C. headquarters and a blessing for the staff brought him past the noon hour.

For luncheon the Cardinal was guest of honor at the National Press Club. Here, facing his first non-Catholic audience, he spoke to the 400 newspaper men. He found high words of praise for the American press; but his theme was peace and the American influence for peace, and he closed his address by inviting his hearers to join in the Pope's daily prayer for peace.

With a police escort the Cardinal then drove to Mount Vernon. Here he inspected the house, laid a wreath on the tomb, said a prayer, posed for the inevitable photographs. Then back to Georgetown and a magnificent, heartwarming reception at the University. A reading of the old charter. The conferring of a degree. A student's address delivered in majestic Latin. A noble response by the Cardinal, dealing with the Carrolls, the Constitution, religious freedom in America, the love of God and country. Then, at seven that evening, the eminent sight-seer boarded his train for New York.

The Cardinal began his air tour of the country on the morning of Sunday, October 25. His plane, an eighteen-passenger Boeing transport, chartered from United Airlines, had been flown to Roosevelt Field not far from Mrs. Brady's home, in order to pick up the Cardinal and his party of six. Insistent photographers and a friendly crowd that broke the barriers delayed the departure for an hour, and it was about half past ten o'clock when the giant silver liner thundered down the runway, lifted into the air, and headed towards New York City. Within a few moments the almost perfect gridiron of Manhattan was slipping under the ship. But the Cardinal wasted no time in gazing down at the city's wonders. He had work to do. His companions reported that high above Broadway he unpacked his portable typewriter and began to tap off a speech.

Over Newark the pilot found his radio beam and nosed his ship towards Cleveland. Within three hours his plane was drumming over the Terminal Tower, and a few moments later, near Berea, it came to earth for refueling. Here, the Cardinal chatted with Bishops Schrembs and McFadden—

thus setting the key of his trip, which, as one looks back upon it, can be seen to have been chiefly a visitation of the nation's bishops.

In the air again the ship headed west for South Bend, Indiana, running after a while into a rain which drenched Bendix Field and somewhat marred the ceremonies, though not the enthusiasm, of the Cardinal's reception there. A long motorcade accompanied the guest from the airport to Notre Dame. There he met three Bishops, faced a great audience of students and guests, accepted a degree, Doctor of Letters, delivered a discourse on Science and Religion, paid a graceful tribute to the University and hurried back to the airport for another westward hop. In Chicago that evening he had dinner with Cardinal Mundelein and a group of leading prelates.

The highpoint of the Cardinal's stop in Chicago was his visit next day to St. Mary of the Lake—"the most beautiful seminary that I have ever seen."

At five o'clock that same afternoon the Cardinal was 300 miles farther northeast and posing for photographs at the airfield in St. Paul. Ten Bishops of neighboring dioceses welcomed him and escorted him to dinner in Archbishop Murray's home.

Tuesday morning began early with a Mass in the Cathedral and an address to the 5,000 persons in the pews. A farewell at the airfield sent the ship into a 600-mile flight which sliced over the corners of four Mid-Western states. At Cheyenne, a stop for refueling and then a thousand-mile course high over the Great Divide and the mountains of Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, California. The landing lights of San Francisco's Mills Field flashed on at eight o'clock to bring in his plane; the Archbishop, the Mayor, a crowd of cheering spectators and an enthusiastic police escort were waiting.

Wednesday was a busy day. A Mass and address in St. Mary's Cathedral. A motor drive with city officials to inspect the nearly finished San Francisco-Oakland Bridge. A halt midway to allow him to bless what the officials called the newest wonder of the world. A glimpse of Treasure Island, still abuilding. A swift visit to San Francisco College for Women. A view of the Golden Gate, its bridge, the ocean. A luncheon and speech at the Seminary. A conversation with the Bishops of Seattle, Reno, Sacramento, Cheyenne. A four o'clock return to his winged ship.

Los Angeles by nightfall. A reception by clergy and laity. Dinner and an evening of talk with Archbishop Cantwell.

Climbing over the barrier of mountains early next morning the Boeing swerved northeast and for an hour or so droned towards the guillotine edge of Nevada State. At the guillotine's point the ship circled to give its distinguished passenger the view of Boulder Dam. A 500-mile flight to Albuquerque. Here a brief stop for a chat with Bishop Gerken. Another stop two hours later for Amarillo and Bishop Lucey. A third at Wichita and a conference with Bishop Tihen. Just before midnight the ship slanted down to the ground at Kansas City. Bishop Lillis (since deceased) was waiting,

and the two prelates talked for an hour "briskly pacing the enclosure during their conference," as all the newsmen noted.

At two o'clock that morning the Boeing was being rolled into the hangar at St. Louis' Lambert Field, and the Cardinal was preparing to sleep a few hours in the home of Archbishop Glennon.

Mass Friday morning in the Cathedral. Conferences with three neighboring Bishops. A trip to the Seminary. A speech to the clergy. An inspection of a hospital. A St. Louis University function granting him a degree, Doctor of Science. Then, exactly twelve hours after his arrival, into the air again, with the silver ship droning over the city, the river, the flat lands of Illinois and Indiana, and dipping to earth at Cincinnati's Lunken Field.

An evening conference with the Archbishop and his four episcopal guests. Next morning a talk to seminarians. An address from the seminary steps to a crowd of the faithful. A cornerstone blessing. A dash to the airport. North to Cleveland, then onwards—with a great detour off the New York beam in order to circle Niagara Falls.

Captain Jack O'Brien put his ship down on Roosevelt Field at 3:30 o'clock Saturday afternoon.

On Sunday he presided and preached at a Solemn Mass in St. Ignatius Loyola's Church, to which representatives of all the city's Religious Orders had been invited. Shortly after noon he went to the Carroll Club and greeted 700 young Catholic business women and their guests. He followed this with a short visit, as their Cardinal Protector, to the nuns of Reparatrix Convent. Thence, at four o'clock, to Fordham University for one of the colorful incidents of his American trip.

A crowd of 10,000 persons, including three Bishops and twenty college presidents, gathered to welcome the Cardinal. He reviewed the military corps and band. He was honored by an academic procession. In the Gymnasium he listened to a history of the University told by a distinguished citizen. His own address—on Catholic education and its contribution to American life in its molding of men and citizens—was nationally broadcast by Columbia. He heard a citation in classical Latin praising his many efforts for peace. He accepted a doctorate of laws. He listened with close attention to the brilliant speech on peace and pacifism by the university's president.

On Wednesday, the Cardinal, scheduled for a brief visit and ten-minute talk to the students of Manhattanville College, vetoed the arrangements in order to speak enthusiastically for more than an hour.

That evening, flanked by fourteen Bishops, he attended the Catholic Club reception at the Waldorf—in the grand ballroom where a great crowd had packed itself, even into the top balconies. A speech by Cardinal Hayes dwelt on the blessing of religious liberty in the United States and the loyalty of American Catholics to the Holy Father. In reply the Papal diplomat summarized his deeply favorable impressions of this country and outlined the enthusiastic report he was making to the Vatican. At the end he received each one of the 2,000 guests.

Next morning (Thursday, November 5) the Cardinal traveled by train to Hyde Park. Arriving at noon at the President's home, he sat at private conference and luncheon, returning to his train at 2:30. The topics of this unusual conversation between the future Pope and the newly elected President were never revealed. The crowd of curious newspaper men who boarded the Cardinal's train questioned him shrewdly; they got a pleasant interview but no news or views at all from the smiling Papal Secretary.

Mayor LaGuardia came to the Brady home on Friday morning to pay his respects, and Governor Smith in the afternoon. Next day was the Cardinal's last in this country. A visit to the Empire State Building and a final view of the city. A great congregation in the Cathedral to recite the *Itinerarium* prayer. The drive to the dock, with an escort of motorcycle police, along with the prelates, reporters and newsreel men. At the dock a crowd of excited citizens with flags howled their affection. In the salon of the liner a formal farewell to the clergy and the press. The Cardinal refused a final interview, but gave out a written statement expressing his admiration for the country and once more speaking out for peace.

The *Conte* sounded its whistle not long after noon, backed into the river, turned south and headed for the Bay.

Someone has estimated that in his month's stay in this country the Cardinal traveled more than 8,000 miles, visited twelve of our sixteen ecclesiastical provinces, conferred personally with seventy-nine bishops. The figures are interesting. But now that the Cardinal has been raised to the Papal throne, certain minor things in the record of his visit begin to take on an increased importance for Americans.

Two things only can be mentioned here. The first is the honest praise he uttered on the day of his arrival, his greeting to "a great people who know how to unite so beautifully and nobly a sense of discipline with the exercise of a just, legitimate, and well-ordered liberty."

The other thing is a photograph. When the Cardinal visited Independence Hall, some one pointed out the Liberty Bell, told him its story, impressed upon him that in the mind of everybody in the country it was the sacred symbol. The Cardinal walked around the bell, carefully reading the Scriptural words graven upon it: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land, and to every inhabitant thereof . . ." Then gently, as if in blessing, he placed his hand upon the bell and smiled, and at that moment the photographers aimed their cameras and shot his picture.

It was a lucky picture, but only now do we begin to realize that it was also a classic picture, destined to be published in all the history textbooks and hung on the walls of every Catholic school. Old Tom Heflin might lift his voice again, for he has publicly feared and predicted this very thing again and again. Here was the Pope in America. Here was the Pope with his hand upon the very symbol of our liberties.

REORGANIZATION

MUCH will be gained if the debate on the reorganization bill can be carried on in an atmosphere cleared of extreme partisanship. Last week a Congressman declared that he would not subscribe to the Ten Commandments if they were to be interpreted by the National Labor Relations Board, and enforced by Mr. Roosevelt. Neither would we, but very probably for a reason which differs from that which prompted the belligerent Congressman to disavow this Administration with all its words and works. Like an increasing number of our citizens, harrowed by Washington partisanship, he would not like the present Administration even were it good.

At the other end of the scale stands Secretary Ickes. By insisting that nothing will meet the present emergency, except the old reorganization bill without change of jot or tittle, he gives color of evidence to the charge that this Administration, thwarted for the moment, is aiming at a bill which puts every Federal bureau and agency under the absolute control of the executive. We hope that the Secretary speaks only for himself.

That some reorganization is necessary, no one doubts. But between the bills presented by Congressman Cochran, of Missouri, and Senator Byrd, of Virginia, we prefer the latter. It seems to us that Mr. Cochran removes the danger which can arise from a number of small bureaucracies and then substitutes the decidedly greater danger of one large bureaucracy controlled by the executive. Again, the Senate measure aims directly at economy, an advantage which, at best, is only incidental in the House bill. Finally, while the Cochran bill allows the dispositions made by the executive to stand unless Congress rejects them within sixty days, under Senator Byrd's bill no disposition is valid unless approved by Congress within twenty days.

It may seem that these criticisms indicate distrust of the executive. They do. In our opinion, the executive has more authority now than he can use for the best interests of the country. It would be an error, it seems to us, to allot a larger measure even to George Washington, assuming, if we may, that he asked it. With the best will in the world, no man is big enough to exercise the authority which the old bill proposed to vest in the executive, and insure results that are beneficial to the country. It is not necessary to suspect his motives. It is sufficient to state that man's physical and intellectual powers are finite.

Whatever bill is adopted by Congress, we hope that it will provide for what we have never had, a real civil-service system. As the Brookings Institute pointed out in a study published on March 5, while in 1932 eighty per cent of government employees were under civil service, the percentage is now about sixty-two. Civil service is the best way of eliminating useless employees. But it must be real civil service, not the substitute of "covering in" now in favor at Washington.

ORGY OR FAIR?

WE had hoped that the New York World's Fair would bar the exhibitions appealing to debased sex-instincts which have disgraced other fairs. Referring to two notorious exhibitors, the *Billboard* for March 4 comments: "At any rate, it will be good publicity for both fairs. And to think that sex was not to raise its ugly head at either!" We refer this comment to the officials in San Francisco and New York, suggesting that they remember that most people are decent, and that decent people and their families can agree to stay away from fairs with exhibitions which outrage decency.

THE WAR

IN time of peace, we are asked to spend billions for war-purposes. These billions are demanded at a time when with hearts depressed for fear of actual destitution more than 10,000,000 of our people are walking the streets, seeking vainly for employment. Perhaps those billions are necessary. In all probability, however, not all of them are necessary. We are putting the nation on a war-footing, and, as Senator Johnson, of California, recently told the Senate, we are not permitted to know why.

We do not know much about these war plans, but there is one thing that every sober-minded citizen knows. It is this: unless checked soon and effectively, the powerful war-mongers at Washington will embroil us in war. War will come so suddenly and so swiftly that the armaments now asked from Congress will be futile. These patrons of war want war, and they will have their wish if they are allowed to continue their criticisms of countries in Europe and the Far East in language that is always impertinent and usually provocative.

The Constitution did not create a nation endowed with authority to set the law for other countries. It was the mind of the wisest of our Founding Fathers, and particularly of Washington, that this Government should hold itself aloof from the differences which might exist in other nations, showing friendship to all as far as possible, but granting to none exclusive favor. They knew that intrusion into the affairs of other nations would sooner or later involve us in war. As Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts,

ONE UNION

NO wage-earner who belongs to a union wants a continuance of the rift between the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. He knows that this discord weakens labor's position by alienating the support of the public. All that keeps these two groups from uniting is the labor racketeer and the self-seeking politician who have bored into the unions. Now that the Supreme Court has marked out more clearly the rights of employe and employer under the Wagner act, the prospect that the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. can reach an agreement is brighter. But the racketeer and the politician must go.

WAR WINGERS DEMAND

put the case in his speech in the Senate on March 2: "It is no business of this country . . . to undertake to determine where justice or injustice lies in any corner of the world, except in the forty-eight States of the United States."

I am convinced that when and if war is raging all about us that there is one certain and absolute way to keep out of war. That way is not to try to administer justice, because we cannot do it; it is not to mix in the affairs of other nations, but to mind our own business; it is to be neutral, honestly, directly, and positively neutral.

Almighty God has not vested this Government with authority to give the law to other nations, to sit in judgment upon them, and to visit with our censure those whom we judge guilty. Nor has that authority, repugnant to our political ideals and to the tradition of our people, been given us by international compact. When our ranking officials undertake to announce that some nations are approved by us and others censured, they stir up resentment here and abroad, create causes of international strife, divide our own people, and should war flare up in some remote corner of the world, may force us to hazard our fortunes, our young men, and our political independence in conflicts from which neither we nor any of the nations involved will emerge victorious.

No patriot can argue that war is essentially evil, but still less can he be a war-monger. If the people cannot be trusted, then Congress at least should be told why it is necessary for the American people to spend billions of dollars for war-purposes.

CHRIST'S VICAR

NO man can search the mind of God. But this we know: despite the machinations of politicians and governments, God elects as He wills the visible head of His Church. Pius XII was chosen even as Peter the Fisherman was chosen: by the Will of God, not by the will of men.

Yet, as far as we can search the dispensations of Divine Providence, God Who from stones can raise up children to Abraham, and Who can use instruments that are contemptible to confound His enemies, rules neither the world nor His Church by miraculous dispensations. Ordinarily, the instrument through which He acts is fitted to the work, although it can rebel, for it is human. But God's purposes cannot be thwarted forever by the malice of man.

In keeping with this Providence, those who stand at the altar are not there by their choice alone. They have been called by God, and the reality of the call has been approved by God's representatives; in the individual instance, by the Levite's Bishop who sees in him the qualities, natural as well as supernatural, which befit the minister at the altar. God has made men, not angels, the dispensers of His mysteries; He works in human ways to reach ends that are Divine.

He might have willed to surround every tabernacle in the world with visible hosts of angels, but He did not. His Son might still communicate Himself to us in all the glory of His Resurrection, but He does not. Hidden under the Sacred Species, He abides silently in the humble tabernacle erected by some missionary in a squalid village, as He does in the tabernacles of glorious basilicas, and He comes to us, not borne by angels, but by the hand of His priest.

Even so might Christ have vested His Vicar on earth with the power which He used when His enemies, coming to crucify Him, were stricken and fell to the ground. To all in the line of Peter, He might have given the command of twelve legions of angels. He did none of these things. But He gave to His Vicar authority to teach even as He taught, infallibly. Pius XII, a man like ourselves, governs the flock of Christ, guards it against its enemies, leads it to running waters in green pastures, with the authority given him alone by the Great Shepherd of the Flock, Who is Christ the Lord, Christ the Teacher and Saviour of mankind.

Hence in no human sense do we rejoice in the unique natural gifts of the man who is Pius XII. He has seen men in many lands. He has stood before kings to present the counsels and admonitions of the Vicar of Christ. He has studied the human heart, and knows its capabilities as well as its weaknesses. We can be humbly grateful that from his youth upward Pius XII responded to the dispensations of Providence, hidden though they were from his mind, so that he comes to the Throne of the Fisherman not only a man who has walked humbly with God in all his days, but a man endowed with the qualities of mind and heart which make him a

leader of men. But his essential authority is apart from these accomplishments, and above them.

Humanly speaking, Pius XII is the man of the hour, for the hour is dark. There is not a nation which has not heard thunder on the horizon presaging the storm of war. Worse even than the fear of the scourge of war of man against man, is the fear of the war of man against God. Irreligion, indifference to religion, hatred of religion fostered by atheistic Communism and neo-paganism, merge with the fear of war to make heavy the hearts of men who know that only in the peace of Christ can the world find peace. In his powerful, yet touchingly beautiful and tender address broadcast to the world on March 3, Pius XII prayed for the establishment of peace, "the sublime gift of heaven, the fruit of charity and justice." These words express the soul of his pontificate.

May God harken to the prayer of His Vicar. Yet the very acclaim with which the whole world greeted the Pontiff, the singular unanimity which prevailed in the Sacred College, as evidenced by the fewness of its sessions, and even the happiness of Catholics in knowing that Pius XII is on the Throne of Peter, invest with fitness questions of grave moment.

Will the Holy Spirit be poured forth on the world in unusual measure during the pontificate of Pius XII, bringing into the fold men and nations who do not know God, or who knowing Him hate Him? Or is God preparing us for some extraordinary conflict with evil?

We do not know, but we do know that at our head is Christ's infallible Vicar. We thank God for his piety, for his wisdom, for his indomitable courage. With Pius XII ruling and guiding us, we shall do our part in battle, manfully and unafraid. From the knowledge that the gates of Hell can attack but never overcome the Church, we draw courage and unbroken peace.

IMMORTALS

FROM his address on March 4, it is evident that the President does not assign the Congress which sat under the Confederation from 1783 to 1789 a high place in our history. "That we survived for six years," said Mr. Roosevelt, "is more a tribute to the ability of the Confederation Congress gracefully to do nothing, and to the exhaustion following the war, rather than to any outstanding statesmanship, or even leadership."

These ancient legislators have long rested with their fathers. Our praise of them or blame will fall upon ears that are dust. But of these men can nothing be said, beyond their ability "gracefully to do nothing"?

Very much can be said. They followed a leadership that was willing to wait, when to press forward meant ruin. But they did more than wait. To provide for the future, they enacted the Ordinance for the Government of the North-West Territory, and they called the Convention of 1787.

Either act suffices to immortalize them.

THAT ALL MAY EAT

TO the Fourth Sunday in Lent, custom attaches the name "Laetare Sunday." The title is obviously borrowed from the opening words of the Introit of the Mass, "Rejoice (*laetare*) O Jerusalem, and come together all you that love her." (Isaias, lxvi, 10.) The rejoicing to which the Church invites us is, of course, wholly spiritual. It is akin to that uplifting of the mind which, as we read in the Preface for Lent, is the fruit of fasting and bodily restraint. In the Gospel too (Saint John, vi, 1-15) we find much to make all who truly love Our Lord, and yearn to be more closely united with Him, experience an uplifting of mind and heart. Surely do we need that spiritual exaltation. For the present moment is full of distress, and the future is dark.

Saint John tells us a story familiar to us from our childhood. The crowds have come out to listen to the preaching of Jesus, and as evening falls they become aware that they have nothing to eat. Our Lord is mindful of their need, and turning to Philip He asks: "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" Philip cannot answer; all that he can suggest is that to feed 5,000 men would require more than "two-hundred pennyworth of bread." Peter's brother, Andrew, is not much more helpful. "There is a boy here that hath five barley loaves and two fishes," he puts in. "But what are these among so many?"

Why Our Lord questioned Philip and Andrew, when "he himself knew what he would do," we do not know, unless we agree with the ascetical writer who thinks that it was to teach them initiative and self-reliance! Whatever Our Lord's reason, He quickly invoked His Omnipotence, and on these five loaves and two fishes 5,000 men feasted. For all had "as much as they would," after which the fragments "which remained over" filled twelve baskets.

Here we have a type of that Great Banquet which Our Lord was to promise on the very next day, and which He gives us in the Most Blessed Eucharist. Hereafter, He was not to feed men with food for their bodies, but with His own Body and Blood as the food of their souls. What Our Lord promises He infallibly fulfils, and that is why we believe that in Holy Communion we receive into our very hearts the Body and Blood, the Soul and Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Our Lord promised to give. Our Lord gave. We do not know *how* He can give, any more than we can fully comprehend the depth of the love which prompted Him to give this gift of Himself. But that He gave, we cannot doubt.

Unfortunately, many Christians rarely receive Holy Communion. Some may even allow many years to lapse without receiving Him. It would be a work of zeal most pleasing to the Eucharistic Heart of Jesus to pray for these Christians that they may at last come back to Him. Many of them are not hardened in sin, but have simply grown careless. Others wish to return but fear they cannot break the chains of sin. Let us give them the help of our good example and of our fervent prayers, so that soon "these may eat."

CHRONICLE

THE ADMINISTRATION. President Roosevelt declared his opposition to the neutrality legislation in operation for the last three years. He also revealed his opposition to the proposed constitutional amendment which would reserve to the people the power to declare an overseas war except in the event of an attack on the United States or its possessions. . . . The President said no steps had been taken with regard to the recognition of the Franco regime in Spain. . . . Congressional authorities sent word to the President that his recent nominee for the Interstate Commerce Commission, Thomas R. Amlie, stood little chance for confirmation by the Senate, counseled him to withdraw Amlie's nomination. The Wisconsin legislature voted a resolution opposing Amlie, charging he was communistic. . . . The President discussed with Secretary Morgenthau the question of tax revision as an aid to business. Secretary Hopkins asserted he would back his words concerning aid to business with action. . . . Assistant Secretary of State, Adolf A. Berle, urged, in effect, the giving of assistance to Great Britain and France against the alliance of Germany, Japan and Italy. . . . The President received a medal awarded by the American Hebrew Magazine for his labors on behalf of religious tolerance. . . . To fill the White House secretarial post vacated by his son James, the President appointed Colonel Edwin M. Watson, his military aide for six years. Colonel Watson was formerly military aide to President Wilson. . . . Laurence A. Steinhardt, Ambassador to Peru, was appointed Ambassador to Soviet Russia. The Ambassador to Spain, Claude G. Bowers, was called home for consultation. . . . The Navy Department dropped German, Italian and Spanish ports from the itinerary of American warships cruising in European waters.

ANNIVERSARY. On March 4, 1789, the First Congress under the Constitution began assembling in New York. On March 4, 1939, the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of the Government celebrated the 150th anniversary of that event in Washington, when a joint meeting of the Senate and House was addressed by President Roosevelt and Chief Justice Hughes. The President declared we will not "approvingly watch the return of forms of government which for 2,000 years have proved their tyranny and their instability alike." Asserting that the vast majority of the American people wish "our form of government . . . preserved," Chief Justice Hughes maintained: "If our checks and balances sometimes prevent the speedy action which it is thought desirable, they also assure in the long run a more deliberate judgment, and what the people really want they generally get." Referring to the three separate branches that make up

the Government, Mr. Hughes said: "We work in successful cooperation by being true, each department to its own functions . . . seeking through the very limitations of power the promotion of the wise use of power." . . . Speaker Bankhead, Senator Pittman addressed the assembly as representatives of the Legislative branch. . . . The day also marked the sixth anniversary of President Roosevelt's inauguration.

WASHINGTON. One sure way to stay out of war, Senator Walsh told the Senate, is "to mind our own business; to be neutral; honestly, truthfully, directly and positively neutral." . . . Senator Johnson maintained a psychosis of fear was being built up in Congress by "trigger men of the Administration . . . for some purpose that we do not know and for some reason that will not be told to us." . . . Senator Walsh and Representative May sponsored the bill requested by the Navy Department to penalize the spreading of subversive propaganda among soldiers and sailors. The American Civil Liberties Union opposes action by Congress in the matter. Other organizations were said to be planning a campaign to prevent passage of the bill. . . . Elliott Roosevelt, son of the President, told the Federal Communications Commission that "a censorship of fear" exists in radio. The law obliging radio stations to renew their licenses every six months "tends to act as a restriction upon free speech," he maintained. . . . As a means of reviving confidence, the National Economy League urged a "deficit-reducing budget" for the fiscal year 1940, to prepare the way for a thoroughly balanced budget later on. . . . The Federal Trade Commission, in a report to the Senate Monopoly Committee, held that the "basing point" system, a plan for arriving at prices for steel products, has ended competition, that through this system the steel industry is able "to decide on a price and hold to it regardless of demand." . . . This "monopolistic infection, if not eradicated, may well cause the death of free capitalistic industry in the United States," the Commission maintained.

THE CONGRESS. Administration Senate leader, Senator Barkley, told the Senate that the foreign policy of the United States is not only to preserve Western Hemisphere peace but to "make some contribution to the preservation of peace in other parts of the world." The Neutrality Act has not tended to keep peace in other parts of the world, he asserted. . . . Senator Clark charged that the Neutrality Act "has never been enforced in the war between China and Japan." . . . The Senate passed the Air Corps expansion bill, authorizing 6,000 airplanes. The House vote had authorized 5,500

planes. . . . The revised Reorganization Bill, known as the Cochran-Warren Bill, was passed by the House, 246 to 153, sent to the Senate. . . . Senator Tydings demanded re-examination of the United States Housing Authority's program. Its present policy he assailed as "the greatest scheme of State Socialism" ever attempted by the United States. "It seems to me to be on the Russian model," he declared. . . . The \$499,857,936 Army Supply Bill was passed unanimously by the House. . . . Senator Harrison announced his opposition to the Administration's desire to raise the statutory limit on the public debt to \$50,000,000,000. The present limit is \$45,000,000,000. He denounced accumulation of deficits, warned of chaos.

AT HOME. Representatives of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L., appointed to achieve labor peace, visited the White House, heard President Roosevelt tell them he was "counting on them to succeed." The C.I.O. proposed a new organization, the American Congress of Labor, to include the A. F. of L., the C.I.O. and the Big Four railway brotherhoods. In this proposed union, neither John L. Lewis or William Green would be eligible for office. The A. F. of L. at first rejected the proposal, later agreed to consider it. . . . Representatives of United Automobile Workers of America locals set up an independent auto workers union, elected Homer Martin president. Fascists, Nazis, Communists were banned from applying for membership in the new union. . . . Paul Sifton, deputy Wages and Hours Administrator in Washington, testifying in Albany, declared he no longer subscribed to the views he advocated in 1933 when he wrote an article urging establishment of "a workers' government." At that time, he said he was "pessimistic . . . as to the continuance of the capitalist set-up." . . .

PAPAL CORONATION. Amid impressive, centuries-old ceremonies and scenes of solemn splendor, the triple crown of the Vicar of Christ was placed on the head of Pope Pius XII in St. Peter's Basilica, on March 12.

SPAIN. The Loyalist fleet, consisting of eleven warships, left Cartagena, steamed into Bizerta, Tunisia where it was disarmed and interned by French authorities. . . . The Government of Premier Juan Negrin was overthrown, March 6, by a National Defense Council, which assumed supreme control in Loyalist territory. General José Miaja became President of the Council, announced: "We want peace, but a worthy peace." . . . Negrin, Del Vayo, other Red leaders, fled by air to France. . . . Communist supporters of the Negrin regime refused to acknowledge the Council. Fierce fighting commenced in the streets of Madrid, spread to other Leftist-held cities. . . . Generalissimo Franco announced his fleet would blockade the entire coastline from Sagunto to Adra. . . . Moscow revealed it would grant entry visas for Dolores Ibar-

ruri, "La Pasionaria"; and other Spanish Communist leaders. . . . Nationalist newspapers said the fleeing Red leaders had prepared refuges long ago and were taking sufficient means out of the country to assure their living comfortably. . . . Marshal Philippe Pétain, who taught Generalissimo Franco in a French war college years ago, was appointed French Ambassador to Nationalist Spain. . . . The body of Bishop Anselmo Polanco of Teruel, murdered by the Loyalists, was brought for burial in the ruins of Teruel Cathedral.

CHINA-JAPAN. An agreement was finally reached whereby Japanese gendarmes will cooperate with Settlement police in an effort to suppress anti-Japanese terroristic activity in the Shanghai International Settlement. . . . Regular air service between Chungking, Chinese capital, and Moscow, was announced. . . . Japanese captured Haichow, 275 miles north of Shanghai. . . . Nipponese air men bombed Ichang, Yungchang, Yungteng, Kulang, Pingliang, Sian. . . . Tokyo announced plans to make the Japanese navy equal to any afloat.

GREAT BRITAIN. Paralleling the action of the United States, Britain extended a 5,000,000 pound credit to China. . . . War Secretary Leslie Hore-Belisha announced Britain would dispatch 300,000 men to France in the event of war. . . . To win more democracy for the people of the State of Rajkot, Mohandas K. Gandhi commenced a fast. In the fifth day of the fast, the British Viceroy, the Marquess of Linlithgow, brought about a settlement. His point won, Gandhi ended the fast with a sip of orange juice.

FOOTNOTES. March 4 was the twentieth anniversary of the founding by Lenin of the Communist International. In commemorating the event, the Moscow newspaper *Pravda* bestowed praise on the Communist party in the United States. In the same issue was an article by Earl Browder. . . . In Germany, Nazi leadership called on youth to abstain from alcohol and tobacco in emulation of Chancellor Hitler. The Reich army bureau and certain other departments commenced paying for material in vouchers equivalent to IOU's. . . . Italian workers received a wage rise ranging from five to ten per cent. 7,000,000 workers come under the increase. . . . At the Socialist party council in France, numerous speakers opposed a sympathetic attitude toward the Vatican, demanded a return to anti-Catholic practices. . . . In Czecho-Slovakia, the autonomous Carpatho-Ukrainian Government was reconstructed. Members of the autonomous Slovak Government were removed from office by the Prague central regime. . . . King Leopold of Belgium dissolved Parliament, called for new elections, upbraided the political parties for their failure to form a cabinet, their avoidance of responsibilities, abuse of executive power. . . . Poland asserted her need of colonial territory.

CORRESPONDENCE

WHITE LIST

EDITOR: Your editorial, *A White List of Employers*, should draw the attention of all thinking people. Without a knowledge of how the things we consume are being produced, we may be contributing to causes that will ultimately drag us down to our own destruction and to slavery.

For more than ten years I have been working on a plan to divert the trading of the masses through channels that would merit their patronage and make possible their desires for security. This plan is based on an organization of the consumers, which embraces everyone, just as it should. It is not difficult to estimate the unlimited power such an association would represent when properly organized and judiciously managed.

I am quite sure that I have mapped out a plan on Consumer Organization that would readily meet with general approval. The idea is not to disturb any present arrangement of commercial activity, but gradually to adjust it to serve more evenly the needs of all. Commerce was established for the benefit of the masses; at present, however, the masses are being used for the benefit of commerce, or rather, for the money interests that control commerce. I plan, merely, to readjust commerce, so that it will again serve its original purpose and I propose to do that gradually and peacefully.

I need advice and assistance to launch my plan. I believe the principal idea could and should be protected by patents or copyright because the plan could be used by selfish interests for personal profits, rather than for public good.

Whatever might be necessary to launch this plan would be reimbursed by revenue from its operation, because it would be easily self-sustaining, even profitable if need be. Neither entry fee nor membership dues would be required; rather, inducements similar to a cash recompense would be given to each member for assistance in the proper conduct and operation.

These expressions are being directed to you in the hope that you can interest people capable of launching such an undertaking. You invite comment on *A White List of Employers*; this, besides fulfilling that requirement, offers a mighty leverage in assuring patronage for those employers and, when all is said and done, that is a prime necessity.

Beaumont, Tex.

D. R. BARRY

LATIN VULGATE

EDITOR: Layman, who asks (January 28) where he can get a copy of the Latin Vulgate and the Bible in the original Greek, might try the Vatican Polyglot Press in Rome. Desclée et Cie., of Tournai and Paris, publish a well-edited edition of the Vul-

gate prepared by Jesuit and Sulpician scholars in Paris. The price is quite low. The Privilegierte Wuertembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, Germany, published a beautiful edition of the *Old Testament* in Greek a few years ago: *Ralfs' Handausgabe der Septuaginta*. It costs less than five dollars. Since all the Greek versions of the *Old Testament* were made by Jews, there seems to be little merit in insisting on a "Catholic" version.

Victoria, Canada

VIC MONTALDI

DISSENT

EDITOR: I wish to express my intense dislike of the article, *Fascist Trends Show Evidence of Nazi Influence*, appearing in your issue of March 4.

This article follows so closely the pattern of every anti-Fascist screed I have read for the past half dozen years that I consider it wholly contemptible and altogether unworthy of AMERICA.

Milwaukee, Wis.

MARK S. GROSS, S.J.

TEXTS

EDITOR: In an otherwise altogether precise and solid presentation of religious security in cadet training at West Point, W. H. Baumer, Jr., authors a statement (AMERICA, March 4) to which I find it impossible not to take exception. After explaining the careful selection of unbiased texts for the history, economics and Government courses, your contributor says: "Subjects such as law, English, French, Spanish and drawing do not admit of such subversive possibilities."

But they do, emphatically so! Many a modern law manual that I have seen assumes that the State is the sole origin and arbiter of all human rights. No one can bestow a blanket *imprimatur* on all modern-language texts. There is, of course, no such thing as an immoral inflection or irreligious syntax. But exercises and passages for translation are powerful instruments of insidious propaganda.

I happen to have on my desk a copy of a German grammar widely used in American colleges. One passage for translation is an edited excerpt from Lessing's *Nathan der Weise*. In a most alluring and persuasive manner Nathan solves the question of the true, authentic religion by saying: "Every religion is the true one, as long as a man believes it and acts on it." To which Lessing adds the comment: "For only God alone knows which one is the only true religion."

Examples could be multiplied beyond number. Many French texts insinuate anti-clericalism. Some Spanish manuals propagate the "Black Legend." The innocence of English is a matter of judicious selection and honest interpretation. The point to be made is that *all* text-books can be offensive.

Woodstock, Md.

JOSEPH T. CLARK, S.J.

LITERATURE AND ARTS

AN AUDIENCE WITH A DEAD POPE

THOMAS GRADY

WHEN we entered the great bronze door of the Vatican, it was early in the morning; the sun was beginning to climb high in the sky. The morning mists were falling apart like old lace. As we mounted the royal staircase, the stairs were barred with full shafts of golden light. Far before us and above, the head of the staircase was strikingly clear. Before we had ascended the whole flight, we turned right and entered a chamber that gave directly into the Sistine Chapel, the most solemn and most exquisitely beautiful chapel in the world. In a moment I was in such a position that I could look over the heads of the crowd before me and see directly into the chapel, look directly into the face of the dead Pope.

Very near to the door which I was approaching was a high catafalque lost under limpid folds of red velvet. Resting upon the catafalque was a red litter or stretcher, so inclined that the Pope's head was higher than his feet, thus making his whole figure plainly visible. The Pope was clad as if prepared for Mass in vestments of red. On his head he wore a miter of red and gold. His feet were tied with a golden cord. In his hands he held a rosary and a crucifix. His figure was wasted and the vestments slumped as if covering little more than a skeleton; his cheeks were hollow and his face the color of pale slate. Around him candles were gleaming. Two Noble Guards stood at attention and with them watched the picturesque, black-clad chamberlains of the Cape and Sword, all laymen. Behind the chancel, in the front of the Chapel there were almost two hundred cardinals, bishops, and monsignors reciting the office for the dead—a little sea of red.

Multitudes of silent, sorrowful people moved slowly past the simple, awesome catafalque. Great dignitaries of state came and went. Great men of the Church were near. But one could have eyes for none of these things. Death, awful and mysterious, had integrated itself into the atmosphere of that tremendous room, had entered into man's history storied on the ceiling by the brush of Michelangelo and found its place as a sequel to the fall of Adam, seemed to add grandeur and imminence to, while it

itself drew power from Michelangelo's "Last Judgment" above the altar. One could think but sweeping and solemn thoughts. In the alembic of this room, over the ghastly blue flames of the death of this great Pope, all trifling considerations were corroded out of mind and the whole history of man from creation to judgment, and the whole purpose of man, were sublimated before one's eyes.

It is paradoxical that death should be so much the story of life; and yet what fact is more constant in or more characteristic of history than death? The very matter of which we are made tends to corruption, to decay; it is our nature to die. Once God would have kept us from the loathsome blight of death; but Adam was foolish, and we must die. The feet that walked in Paradise are dust, and dust are the eyes that saw the Deluge dry. Still is the great heart that did not falter on Sinai's top. And Pharaoh's legions all are gone. Trackless sands are softly blown around the Pyramids: silent cities and patient ruins are buried deep. Plato's heart will dream no more, and Phidias' hand is cold. Amid the sun-swept silence of the Forum violets bloom across the ruins. The Crusader's sword is broken now, and the scimitar is sheathed with rust. Feudal flags are tattered; and mighty kings are sleeping. Listless waves wash Helena's shore as if awash with death once more. Forgotten, a rotting corpse is on a Spanish field; and ugly things are floating on the Yangtze. Here in this room history is epitomized and pantomimed. The Prince of Italy, Heir-apparent to the throne, is here; bishops fill the choir; and the wondering people shuffle by. Candles gleam on red and gold—and on the pallid figure of him who is dead.

It is hardly less paradoxical that the meaning of life flames so brightly from the ashes of death. Here the walls were priceless with the story of Creation and Redemption and Judgment, with shallow symbols through which, as through a transparent veil, genius has made the meaning of life appear. But genius has not the brush of death: genius is a masterful teacher; the presence of death is a profound experience. Genius is unbelievably acute, subtle and clear; death is as accurate, per-

sonal and unmistakable as a whip. The artist said: "Life is from God: one day God stooped down and with His breath made a slimy thing into a lovely man. The lovely thing was lost and ruined, and God bowed His Head and breathed His last Breath to make it lovely once again. And so life of God is for God, and some day God will thunder down to seek a reckoning."

But death says: "See the candles by my side. A Pope is sleeping in my arms. I hear the shuffling of the feet of passers-by; I hear the murmured prayers. Serenely he sleeps, like a child in my arms, and does not hear. You that pass, does it matter much that he was lowly born? Does it matter that sixty of his years were so obscure? And just which way does it matter that he has thwarted kings and been thwarted in his turn? Was it worth the while to be racked with bodily pain, to be sick with worries, weary of the coolness of friends and the passion of enemies? Does it seem much that he surrendered the familiar peace of the library for clashing Polish wills? Does it matter much that from his finest victory there blossomed first a briar of anti-clericals? Softly, softly you go, who pass him by; but his sleep is sure within my arms. What was it worth to wear the white? What was it worth to rule across the world? What is pain, what is triumph, what are all the little acts called living? They are a magic that can bring you past my arms. They are fires that can sear and seal your soul with eternal pain. They are monies for glory, swords for victory, journeys for home. Little, little things, they are powers beyond my power.

"Come closer, you, and I will whisper this for you alone. This little one is sleeping now, so high and grand upon his catafalque. Once long ago he scaled the lofty side of Monte Rosa. Night found him on the mountain's top, worn with climbing, and clinging to a tiny ledge; he pressed his back against the shaggy wall, forgot the hungry depths below, and watched the stars grow bright against the night. He vigiled with the passing hours until the dawn blushed into the east; and then he counted not his pains before the glory of the sun.

"White-clad, now, he climbed a weary and lonelier trail, until at last, almost with joy, he crept into my arms. We alone vigil with the star-eyed candles here, for he has leapt ahead—gone beyond the dawn and found the Sun."

THE FIELD IS WIDE OPEN

ENCOURAGEMENT can be offered to the many young writers who are beginning to be harassed by the urge or the competence to write, by telling them, on the assurances of the undersigned, that the field is as wide open as it ever was.

All the publishing houses and all the magazines are swamped with manuscripts, yet both groups have still to send out scouts to find new authors. Mr. Latham of Macmillan's told me he had almost forcibly to extract from Miss Margaret Mitchell the manuscript of her now-famous novel. At one time in the past year there were forty-eight dark the-

atres on Broadway. Why? Because of lack of audiences? No. And certainly not because of lack of good actors and actresses. But simply because the producers could not find enough good plays.

There is a fortune waiting for anyone who can write a really humorous book. Another fortune for a book which can make people cry. In the field of verse, which always presents the most over-swamped mail bag in the sanctums of editors and publishers, there is probably more opportunity for good work to succeed at the present time than there has been since the beginning of the century. Believe it or not, it is an extremely difficult thing to get a good piece of verse. And believe it or not, poetry editors do *not* delve into the run of the morning tide with a sour face and a determination to kill off talent with rejection slips. One opens every single envelope with a feeling of expectancy, bracing himself for the delightful experience of discovery. It does not matter either whether the author is known or unknown, heralded or unheralded, whether he comes with recommendations or not.

"Well for pity's sake, what does he want?" I can hear the contributor say of the poetry Editor. I am not going to answer that question by telling merely what *he takes*. He takes the best he can get, and tries to be satisfied. It would be easiest to show practically and by example what he wants. He wants a verse which begins like this:

I hear my husbands marching
The aeons all adown,
The shepherd boys and princes
From cavern unto crown

even though the author is only a little ten-year-old girl in nearby Brooklyn. Or else one that ends like this:

One moment so I saw them
With time come back full tide,
The host of girls, your grannies,
Who lived and loved and died
To give your mouth its beauty,
Your soul its gentle pride,
Who wrestled with the ages
To give the world a bride

even though the author is an elderly Englishman in far-off Tokio.

Verse contributors vary among: 1. Those who have not the slightest notions about the technique of verse (they always remind me of a man seized with a sudden inspiration, who rushes to the piano; "Have you ever played the piano before?"; "No, but you never can tell what will happen.") 2. Those who do know the technique of verse but are incapable of realizing or communicating any valuable human experience (persons in this class abound in the magazines devoted exclusively to verse; they keep on repeating and repeating in faultless technical patterns the most unexhilarating ideas), and 3. Those who possess the two requirements above mentioned, but lack the power to charge their verse with that felicity, finality, inevitability of statement which lifts it out of its humbler category and puts it into the realm of pure poetry. The last "trick" can never be taught. But there is an extreme scarcity of those who manage it, and the field is wide open.

L. F.

NOT BEING AQUIN

The prism of a poet's eye
Will harrow me until I die
And, undiffused by senses, see
The white light of reality.

The wave-length of the green of hope
Is constant in the spectroscope,
But in my soul it tends to show
Blent with the band of indigo.

To hue and mood committed here,
Not being Aquin, I revere
His brain that shone with syllogisms—
But my mind is lit by prisms!

ALFRED BARRETT

CLIMB UP TO GOD

(for Richard)

He said he would "climb up to God," believing
That God is in the sky like some great bird.
All words are new; in God he is achieving
The word that is the Word.

He is too young to know of Jacob's ladder,
Unto whose ultimate rung so few arrive,
But he is close to God and he is gladder
Than anything alive.

JESSIE CORRIGAN PEGIS

EX VOTO CMH

I think I'll write a poem now on Gerard Manley Hopkins,
Except that for that name of his there's no convenient
rhyme;

Never mind that, however, for I want to show this time
The gay familiarity, the reverence loving-like
I feel toward this saint of ours, this contemplative tyke,
So I'll not watch my metre much, nor force such rhymes
as "drop kins,"

But simply say, "Good afternoon to you in Heaven,
Gerard,

"How are the plants of Paradise, and how is Richard
Crashaw?

"And Uriel Archangel, and Scotus, now your crony?

"Surely there is an Oxford School up there beyond the
stars;

"Newman, I guess, is schoolmaster and you and Scotus
scholars,

"Discussing angelology among the golden bars;

"Sitio, Gerard, some of us have thirsted to be by you,

"Your tropes have rendered tasteless now the world's
drab lunapars;

"Throw then a rose of Grace unto these lands of pounds
and dollars,

"These lands bedrabbed with gentlemen and democrats
and Edens,

"These Saxon deserts waterless, who will not know our
Mary . . .

"Ah, that you see her beauty now! . . . ah, all that sweet-
ness nigh you!

"For you too, Gerard, found this Life of Progress hard
to carry."

DAVID GORDON

WHITHER THOU GOEST

What way I go beneath a sky or steeple
I walk beside a Jew. What way I reach
Toward love, the vow: Thy people be my people,
Thy God my God, can summarize my speech.

I turn from my own sister and my brother
And down the alien meadows, proud and bold,
Accompany a young Jew and His mother
Of a distinguished lineage and old.

His family are divided and dispersed,
Scattered as idle seed on every hand,
And I am with that homelessness accursed.
I left my land and now I have no land.

These are my people, I am yet their stranger.
They have no knowledge of His face or name
Who, once enamoured of a winter manger,
Cast off His cloak of glory as He came.

Driven and lost and persecuted by a
Wide land they go, a sad incredulous race,
And I, who saw the face of the Messiah,
Speak to the cherished brother in each face.

JESSICA POWERS

THIS ONE HEART-SHAKEN

It was only my own voice that I had heard,
but at first I did not know it for my own.
Although my lips had formed no single word
and the voice seemed one that I had never known,
still it was mine. I knew that it must be:
this secret voice that I had not surmised.
this cry flung from the unsuspected sea
of loneliness by which I was surprised.
It was as though my other selves came thronging
to see this wonder washed up on the shore,
this one, heart-shaken with immortal longing
that must possess its life forever more.
And over and over again one cry she made:
"I am afraid of silence. I am afraid."

SISTER MARIS STELLA

BOOKS

CATHOLIC POETS OF PENAL TIMES

RECUSANT POETS. By Louise Imogen Guiney. Sheed and Ward. \$6

THE soul of Louise Imogen Guiney must have rejoiced in Heaven to see this work (at least one volume of the two that are to appear) completed. It was the work at which she was laboring most assiduously at the time of her death in 1920. Thanks are due to many who are responsible, along with her, for the book, chiefly Archbishop Goodier, S.J., who suggested the work, though in a much smaller plan; Fr. Geoffrey Bliss, S.J., who collaborated with Miss Guiney in the selection and editing of material up to the time of Miss Guiney's death; and finally, and not least importantly, Edward J. O'Brien who, in honor of this cherished friend of his boyhood, finished the task of editing and publication.

The Recusants are a group of Catholic poets who wrote from about the middle of the sixteenth to about the middle of the eighteenth century. Some were converts. A few later lapsed from the Faith. But the burden of their Catholic song is here presented. There are familiar names like Saint Thomas More, Blessed Edmund Campion, Blessed Robert Southwell. There are many unfamiliar ones discovered after patient search.

Louise Guiney was not only a great poet in her own right, and a critic of impeccable taste; she was a great scholar, and the notes and biographies which abound in the book are set down with an almost passionate exactitude. The book will have as much historical as literary interest, but in both rôles it has satisfied completely this reviewer. The Recusants sang sometimes a gay, sometimes a sad, sometimes a challenging, sometimes a satirical song. I am in the throes of repeating often to myself, since having read it, Gregory Martin's *Questions to the Protestant*, which is as witty as it is irrefutable.

Grace Guiney, Louise Guiney's cousin and literary executor, offers as credentials for the latter's ardent preoccupation with the poets of Catholic England the fact that she was a descendant of the de Gyneys, a noble family of Norfolk in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Was it needful to have gone back quite so far in genealogy? Goodness knows where any of us were in blood four or five centuries ago. Americans, particularly Irish-Americans, will be quite satisfied to know that the poet's father, Patrick Guiney, was born in Ireland in 1834, came to America, was graduated from Holy Cross College, and became a Brigadier-General in the Civil War. Also that the funds for the issuance of this book were largely, if not wholly, collected by Fr. James A. Magner, of Chicago. Let us hope that this great American and Catholic poet, whose memory and fame have ever been kept alive in America, will at long last be appreciated in the alien land to the resurrection of whose literary and Catholic past she gave the best of her mind and labors.

LEONARD FEENEY

SPRAYED WITH MARXIST AROMA

BETRAYAL IN CENTRAL EUROPE. By G. E. R. Gedye. Harper and Bros. \$3.50

DURING the last days of Austrian independence, nearly everybody in the Vienna streets seemed to be wearing either Schuschnigg's Fatherland Front ribbon or

the Swastika badge. Mr. Gedye wore a red carnation—traditional badge of Austrian Socialism. He must have put together this shoddy piece of special pleading in a room filled with red, red carnations. The Marxist aroma is so pungent, indeed, that it tends to stultify our natural sympathy for all victims of Nazi persecution. Mr. Gedye does not merely hate Hitler and those responsible for the Munich accord. His rage is so venomous and so unrestrained that, in the latter part of the book, he becomes mildly hysterical. He is a member of that school of journalism which has recently become very proficient in tearing the passions to tatters while ignoring every other issue not included in the Marxist doxology.

Mr. Gedye came to Vienna as correspondent for the *London Times*, and later, for the *New York Times*, during the post-war reconstruction period. For twelve years he recorded Austria's fight for survival. Expelled by the Nazis in 1938, he established an office in Prague. From this point of vantage he covered the events leading up to the dismemberment of Czecho-Slovakia. The book closes with a severe castigation of Prime Minister Chamberlain and the "surrender gang" from Downing Street.

During the chancellorship of Monsignor Seipel, the cabinet faced a situation closely approaching civil war. The Republic comprised roughly two districts which were nearly equal in population though not in area. The workers of Vienna, of the plain in eastern Austria which extends southward from the capital as far as Weiner-Neustadt, and of the Styrian mining districts formed an industrial proletariat with socialistic and anti-clerical leanings. Most of the remaining Austrians were agrarian, conservative and Catholic. As a consequence of these differences there developed a bitter antagonism between the "Reds" of Vienna and the "Blacks" of the rural districts.

Mr. Gedye's sympathies in this struggle for power are quite obviously with the anti-clericals. Looking back, he sees Austria paying in 1938 the penalty for the impress of "clericalism" and "bigotry" first given the country by Seipel and made indelible by Dollfuss and Schuschnigg. The proletariat had been made powerless to overthrow the "Clerical-Fascist tyranny," which was itself too weak to triumph in the two-front war against Nazism and Revolutionary Socialism. He is of the naïve opinion that the Nazi invasion could have been prevented by some sort of Popular Front government composed of Catholics and anti-Catholics, the nature of which it is hard to surmise.

Mr. Gedye similarly regards the Czecho-Slovakian issue in simple but partisan terms. The nation's alliances were with Russia and France, he informs us, not with the Third International and French Freemasonry. The nation was one—despite the fact that the order for general mobilization had to be broadcast in five languages. Germany was pitifully weak in material reserves and in technical personnel for a major war. The Russian armies, on the contrary, were terribly efficient. Democracy was arrayed against Fascism. But the British lion was hypnotized by the Swastika snake.

This hastily written book contains many exciting personal experiences. Mr. Gedye's descriptions of the bestiality of the Nazi terror are vivid and unforgettable. His knowledge of the European political jungle is extensive. It is a great pity that a journalist possessing so many excellent qualifications for his job should have succumbed to an ideology that has narrowed his range of vision to such an extent that the intelligent American reader can only accept his opinions, verdicts and conclusions with considerable misgiving.

JOHN J. O'CONNOR

SPLENDID HISTORY AND ENGAGING FICTION

THE TREE OF LIBERTY. By Elizabeth Page Farrar and Rinehart. \$3

A MERE glance at the imposing bibliography that accompanies this novel might lead one to suspect that Miss Page has studied long and carefully before putting a dash of fiction into the history that is *The Tree of Liberty*. Hollywooders would call the book colossal. Certainly it is important and tremendously interesting. Into its almost thousand pages is crowded a somewhat detailed chronicle of half a century, recording the years between 1754 and 1806, when the American colonies were growing out of the gangly stage to a firm and sturdy maturity. Five years were spent in writing the volume, years, one may safely suppose, in which facts were sifted and selected to be woven into this great historical narrative which centers with particular emphasis about four generations of two families, the Peytons and the Howards.

Strangely enough Matthew Howard, a rugged frontiersman from the Shenandoah Valley, married Jane Peyton, an aristocrat of Tidewater. Naturally there was a clash in traditions, in ideals, in viewpoints. For Matthew was most intolerant of anything in Government policy that infringed on personal liberty as he understood it, while Jane with an aristocrat's love of order, restraint and refinement, frowned upon the crudities of the frontier and stood firmly for all acts of the Government.

If any least trace of happiness was to be kept in their lives a compromise was needed, and it was made. For Jane, the daughter of a Williamsburg planter, Matt Howard built a plantation home, wherein the haughty lady applied herself to household crafts and succeeded in making herself the object of neighborly dislike. There was, however, no compromise of ideals.

The sons took up the struggle and kept it alive. Peyton who inherited his father's championship of the oppressed and his Jeffersonian political outlook married the daughter of a liberal French nobleman, named one of his two children Thomas Jefferson Howard. James, who shared his mother's opinion that Jefferson was a renegade, established himself as a manufacturer with cotton mills in Rhode Island, hoping thus to make a fortune for his son. And so the tangle of political feud went on. The Howards and the Peytons, their sons and grandsons were merely children of the age in which they lived—a first cousin to our own.

Of historical characters Miss Page has given us a large gathering. There are Washington, Patrick Henry, Adams, Madison, Burr, Slater, Hamilton and James Monroe. In her picture of Thomas Jefferson she has given us a hint of her own political leanings. No character in this large volume quite measures up to her portrayal of this noble democrat.

If Miss Page has done nothing else, she has certainly recaptured a very interesting period of history and retold it in a very attractive way. It was her conviction that "the age of Mr. Jefferson held enough that was parallel with our own, for a study of it to have peculiar value in this perplexed day." Her story would seem to bear out this attitude.

The Tree of Liberty is splendid history and engaging fiction. It will doubtless be read and remembered as both.

JOSEPH R. N. MAXWELL

AS ONCE YOU WERE. By A. S. Hutchinson. Little, Brown and Co. \$2.50

AT fifty-four Piers Exceat is ready to test a long cherished theory. Ever since the distant day when his honeymoon had been blotted out by the death of his bride, he had found himself listless and without response to the appeals of life, but he looked back wistfully at his early years when life was filled with joyful eagerness. His theory was the possibility of recapturing that respon-

siveness and it rested on the assumption that past experiences had left vestiges in the soul which by proper manipulation could be made to stand out clearly. He would try to get back to boyhood by taking up again some of his boyhood activities.

Not rich, but with enough for his purpose, he buys a neglected country estate on the border of an English village, plunges into the task of restoring the ground by his own labor, seeks recreation in bicycling and stamp collecting, and even turns over the pages of favorite boy magazines. His chief joy comes from helping others and there are some strange types at hand—an irresponsible lad whom he makes his personal servant, an old chair-maker reduced to begging and a wild hatred of society, and an aspiring author trying to write a best-seller to finance his marriage. He convinces himself that giving is the best part of life and at the close rises to heights of self-sacrifice in promoting the happiness of others.

The story is odd, and so is the style, but it is interesting and beneath the surface sentimentality there is a recognition of the real facts of life that consist in man's spiritual aspirations. The author, however, seems never to have heard of Christ nor of the heavenly simplicity with which He dissipates the fogs of loose thinking and puts life on its proper plane of the supernatural.

WILLIAM A. DOWD

I MARRIED A GERMAN. By Madeleine Kent. Harper and Bros. \$3

MARRYING a German from Saxony in 1931, Madeleine Kent, an Englishwoman, surrendered her British passport, and became a German subject. Two years later the Nazis were in power, and when the author applied for permission to leave Germany to visit her sick father in England, she began to find out what Hitler's Germany meant to the wife of a Socialist. Only after endless bickering with local police did she obtain the requested permission, being required first to secure from England a medical certificate testifying to her father's sickness, together with documents from English police proving the doctor's signature.

This incident is typical of a constant petty persecution suffered by the author and her husband for two more years, until finally, with considerable spunk and persistence, she bullied her tormentors into granting permission to return to England for good. The book retails few horror stories, though it hints at many. But it reveals the utter subjection of a people to the crushing philosophy of totalitarianism. The author writes well, and maintains a praiseworthy objective point of view, despite her personal difficulties with German officialdom.

ROBERT A. HEWITT

A PHILOSOPHY OF WORK. By Etienne Borne and Francois Henry. Translated by Francis Jackson. Sheed and Ward. \$2.50

THE problem of work is here given new and rather original treatment. Though not pretending to be exhaustive, the book is complete and compact from the historical and philosophical point of view. The authors work out a philosophy which meets the demands of Christianity and realizes the highest social ambitions of the worker by clearly formulating the relation of work to other human activities, especially Art and Contemplation. The changing attitudes toward work in ancient, medieval and modern times are briefly described, and popular misunderstandings of Scripture on the problem are corrected.

The authors insist that, since the purpose of work is the material and moral perfection of man by making the world more human and humanity more fraternal, the problem is not merely moral and social, but also religious. They show how work leads to prayer and is the best preparation for Contemplation. In a practical application of their theories to a critical study of Stokhanovism, they condemn it as a subordination of man to work. The book is overflowing with stimulating thought for those who would instruct labor in its rights and duties.

ALOYSIUS J. MILLER

ART

THEATRE

IT is interesting to read in the newspapers of the feasts of art which have been or are being prepared for our delectation at the two World's Fairs. That in San Francisco has already opened under the rather crushing designation of "The Fine Arts Section of the Golden Gate International Exposition." All reports indicate that an excellent piece of work has been done. It is interesting to note that, in addition to elaborate showings of older masterpieces and representative specimens of contemporary art, there is a place given to the ecclesiastical productions of the Monterey Guild, that organization of Far Western craftsmen headed by the indefatigable Charleton Fortune, which has so earnestly dedicated itself to the improvement of church art, particularly Catholic.

The plans for the New York fair are now quite definite. There will be two art buildings, one directed to contemporary American art under the direction of Holger Cahill, the other, "Masterpieces of Art," which will house specimens of the great work of the past. The latter exhibition is to include some 400 paintings. It is under the direction of Dr. William R. Valentiner, of the Detroit Art Institute, ably assisted by Messrs. Alfred Frankfurter (Editor of the *Art News*), Alexander Hamilton Rice (Professor of Ichthyology at Harvard) and Charles R. Henschel (President of Knoedler's). A large portion of the pictures to be shown at Flushing are from abroad, and hence have never been available to Americans, except such as have had the opportunity of seeing them abroad.

One cannot help feeling that such exhibitions, in connection with a world's fair, are of real value. Many a visitor will go through such a gallery who would never think of going to an art museum. And there can be no question that merely looking at great paintings can have its educative effect. Naturally I should be the last person to approve of anything which would confirm public taste in its admiration for what is dead and gone at the expense of what is alive. But in matters of taste it is certainly better for a person to have seen some good things, even at the risk of being prejudiced against the contemporary, rather than to have seen nothing except the vulgarities of most commercial art. To a European, who is more or less used to seeing the masterpieces of the past, the idea of such a showing in the midst of a purely commercial fair might seem a trifle incongruous. To us, on the contrary, it gives some leaven to a naturalistic mass and it can lead to interest and knowledge where none was before.

From the purely human point of view, such an undertaking possesses much interest. Yet how many people realize the difficulties that stand in the way? To gather together national treasures and to secure permission to borrow them from the countries that cherish them is no small task and involves the practice of a high order of diplomacy. It is hard enough to persuade a rich individual to part with his treasures. One can imagine how much harder it would be to persuade a Board of Trustees or—worst of all—a group of government bureaucrats.

On February 23 the Worcester Museum (Worcester, Mass.) opened a large loan exhibition of Flemish paintings. Out of the 132 pictures in the show, a large part are from the Johnson Collection of Philadelphia; some are from abroad, some from American private collections. Messrs. Henri Marceau and Francis H. Taylor have made a fine selection to initiate the public in this department of art, and those living in the Worcester (to March 12) or Philadelphia (at the museum, March 25—April 26) neighborhoods are presented with an excellent opportunity to see a cross-section of Flemish art.

HARRY LORIN BINSSE

THE LITTLE FOXES. If Miss Tallulah Bankhead wakes up in the morning with the feeling that nobody loves her, as most of the rest of us do at times, she is very ungrateful. A big new play, *The Little Foxes*, has come to town, a play that will hold the stage of the National Theatre throughout the season, throughout the duration of the World's Fair, and probably throughout long periods in which other playwrights are taking a rest. But instead of rejoicing because Miss Lillian Hellman, the author of *The Little Foxes*, is having a big success, and because Herman Shumlin, the producer, is having one, and because the great loyal theatre-going public of New York is having a new success to go to, every critic in this big city is throwing up his hat because Tallulah Bankhead has a success.

Not that this reviewer objects to that. Miss Bankhead is one of the two or three very best of our American actresses. It is hard to think of more than one or two—say Ethel Barrymore and Grace George—who are equal to her. Notwithstanding this, and the additional fact that she is one of the hardest working players on our stage, Miss Bankhead has not had a lasting success for eight years. High praise for every rôle she played, of course! But no play that fitted her, that gave her a chance to let out every stop she has and show the public something which the theatre can offer us only at long intervals!

The Little Foxes is such a play—grim, dramatic and powerful—the stage's grimmest lesson in human greed. It has no love interest whatever—no sex appeal. It is a drama of greed for money, in which a family of the new South, two brothers, a sister and the son of one of the brothers, lock horns in a life-and-death struggle over money. Each is determined to get all the others have, all their neighbors have, and all their business associates have, if possible. They covet their neighbor's goods, though not his wife. They stop at nothing. Lying, cheating, robbery and murder are the means by which these *Little Foxes* "spoil the vines" and destroy the "tender grapes" around them.

Every rôle in the play pictures with merciless fidelity a character who in meanness, acquisitiveness and greed is a stench in the nostrils of his neighbors. The hypocritical brother is there, smug and unctuous. The cowardly brother is there, egging on his contemptible son to the robbery he himself dare not attempt. Their sister, the wife of the one decent man in the play, sits quietly watching her husband die through lack of the heart stimulant within reach of her hand. She wants him out of the way, that she may in the end control his money and all the money and the business all the members of the family are fighting for. She shoves him out of the way through the gates of death, and then serenely fleeces each of her brothers out of the shares they have stolen.

"You will be working for me, after this," she tells the hypocrite, and the curtain falls on her triumph over them all.

There is hardly a moment of the play when drama is not snapping and crackling like a telegraph set in full operation. There is hardly a moment when Miss Bankhead is not dominating the play, and an inspired company and the entire audience, by the best acting she has ever done. She has put herself inside the skin of a cold-blooded, ruthless, insatiable woman, and has given us an impersonation many of us will carry into our nightmares.

Patricia Collinge does beautiful work in her featured rôle of a lady of the Old South, and Carl Reid and Dan Duryea are capital as the brothers. But *The Little Foxes* is Miss Bankhead's play—and Miss Hellman's.

ELIZABETH JORDAN

FILMS

THE LITTLE PRINCESS. Frances Hodgson Burnett's sentimental novel is admirably suited to Shirley Temple's talents, representing as it does the triumph of right over reason and good over abundant probabilities of misfortune. It is the infinite stretch of coincidence which lends her tales their peculiar, happy distinction. The familiar story opens with Captain Crewe's departure for the Boer War, leaving his young daughter in a boarding school. When he is reported dead, she is reduced by the forbidding mistress to the kitchen, but runs away to seek the father she knows is still alive. And find him she does, though it takes the aid of the Queen herself to reunite the family. Walter Lang has handled the story with sensitive perception and, consequently, accents its emotional pull to camouflage its structural lapses. The piece is two parts fantasy, and any attempt at logic in the direction would have resulted in dullness. An elaborate dream sequence, in which the graces of costume and ballet are invoked, adds to the delightful unreality of the production, which is entirely in color. The star's performance is compacted of imagination, pathos and unaffected charm and she is bounded on all sides by excellent characterizations from Richard Greene, Ian Hunter, Sybil Jason, Anita Louise, Cesar Romero and Beryl Mercer. Only crustaceous adults will refuse to be beguiled by this fairy tale, but it is especially recommended to the young in spirit. (*Twentieth Century-Fox*)

SPIRIT OF CULVER. Cast in the inspirational mold and with heavy emphasis on juvenile appeal, this film rings the changes on filial piety and manliness in an extension of Hollywood's new patriotism campaign. Instead of hollow phrases about saving democracy and attacks on various *isms*, the picture attempts to show democracy at work in the story of a boy of the streets who is retrieved by the social service of the American Legion and established at Culver Military Academy. His attitude toward the school turns from skepticism to enthusiasm as he wins recognition for his father, long thought dead, as a World War hero. The cast of boys is expertly managed by Joseph Santley. Jackie Cooper and Freddie Bartholomew, who have lost the bloom of their movie youth, do well enough as cadets, assisted ably by Henry Hull and Andy Devine. This is a palatable object lesson for the younger generation. (*Universal*)

NEVER SAY DIE. The title of this opus is a forthright declaration of policy from the producers of the latest of an interminable series of farces based on marriage. No one has yet reduced the subject to hilariously comic terms but evidently Hollywood means to go on trying. In this case, the frenzied attempts of an heir and heiress to circumvent fortune hunters by turning cannibal and marrying each other make for spasmodic fun, but then only of the slapstick variety. Since the heir expects certain death in thirty days from a fatal ailment, the marriage seems doomed for several reasons but love blooms amid mistaken diagnoses. Bob Hope's verbalisms vie with Martha Raye's eccentric humor, both strained and silly at times. There is not much to be said for the film except that it is not habit-forming. (*Paramount*)

WOMAN DOCTOR. The conflict of a woman's career and her marriage is settled in vague, melodramatic terms in a film which makes up for its lack of profundity by vivid incident and a degree of suspense in its conclusion. Only an emergency operation on her daughter, performed in an airplane, reconciles the heroine's professional zeal and maternal instinct. Frieda Inescourt and Henry Wilcoxon are intelligent in typical rôles. This is average adult entertainment. (*Republic*)

THOMAS J. FITZMORRIS

EVENTS

TRAINING their concentrated fire on the neutrality legislation, opponents are raising a clamorous chorus of protest. "It has aided the aggressor. It has injured the victim. It has not been productive of peace," they cry.

... An answering salvo booms from advocates of the law. "The neutrality law was called the neutrality law because it was a neutrality law. Its object was to keep the United States neutral in all foreign wars. A neutral nation is one that does not favor either the aggressor or the victim. In 1917, because we succored one side we were drawn into the war, and out of the experience so dearly bought then grew the present neutrality legislation. This legislation is not designed to keep other nations out of war, devoutly though that object is wished for by all. It is designed to keep the United States out of war. What you people really desire is Pro-Victim legislation, or Anti-Aggressor legislation. Despite the ghastly lesson of 1917-18 you want the United States to go off the neutral standard once more." ... Another heated argument is agitating the nation at the same time. In the Senate is a proposal for a constitutional amendment.

Under this proposal, Congress would keep the right to declare war in the event of attack upon United States territory, or of invasion of any territory in the Western hemisphere. But where United States territory is not attacked, or Western Hemisphere territory, the Congress would lose the power to declare war. The people who do the dying and who pay for the defaulted debts would alone have the power to put the United States into a foreign war. ... Opponents of this proposed measure declare it would tie the hands of the State Department, hamper the Administration in the conduct of foreign affairs. ... Advocates say it would have been a good thing in 1917 if the hands of the State Department had been tied, a good thing if the Administration of the period had been hampered. If the people had the decision at that time, these advocates assert, 180,000 American corpses now mixing with the mud of France might today be 180,000 living Americans mixing with their loved ones in their native land, and eleven billion American dollars might be giving employment to millions of Americans instead of building battleships for defaulting, "peace-loving" nations. ...

Thus the debate goes on. ... Only giant intellects, of course, can perceive which side is right. But one cannot avoid guessing which side a certain group would be on, if that group could be assembled. ... If the young boys who were shipped by boatloads "over there" to "make the world safe for democracy" and whose bullet-riddled bodies have ever since been pushing up poppies in Flanders Fields and in France—if they could be brought back we think we know what they would say. ... Suppose they were given a month from their graves. ... Imagine a throng of them, khaki-clad, steel-helmeted, in the galleries of the House and Senate, listening to Senators or Representatives declaring, in effect, that the United States must cease being neutral, that a few men must retain the power to manœuvre the nation into war.

... See them standing up and telling their story to the startled Congressmen. ... What Senator, what Representative could vote for unneutrality, vote against letting the people decide, if he had to vote in the presence of those 180,000 dead boys, victims of former unneutrality. ... See the dead A.E.F. marching, without bands, through New York, Chicago, San Francisco, New Orleans, Philadelphia. A march like that across the nation would mean victory for neutrality legislation, victory for the popular referendum on war.

THE PARADER